

Alan Watt on “Truth Quest with Melodee”

[Home](#) › [Forums](#) › [The Carried Word](#) › [The Carried Word 2009](#) › Alan Watt on “Truth Quest with Melodee” [Favorite](#) | [Subscribe](#)

This topic has 276 replies, 1 voice, and was last updated 1 day, 7 hours ago by  Alan.

Viewing 8 posts – 271 through 278 (of 278 total)


← 1 2 3 ... 17 18 19

Author

Posts

October 22, 2025 at 7:41 am

[EDIT](#) | [MOVE](#) | [SPLIT](#) | [TRASH](#) | [SPAM](#) | [UNAPPROVE](#) | [REPLY](#) [#914](#)



[Alan](#)

Keymaster

(127.0.0.1)

You know, we are in a stage of change, or transition, as they keep calling it at the top, transition. This is the century for transition where, supposedly, at the end of a hundred years, which ties in with the hundred years war that Mr. Rumsfeld kept talking about and kept wondering what does he mean? It wouldn't take a hundred years to finish off the Middle East, well, he wasn't talking about the Middle East, he was talking about the big agenda, the agenda that's been planned for an awful long time and it's been brought about, surreptitiously and through stealth, by big Foundations, big Non-Governmental Organisations, coupled with the United Nations and funded by all the big eugenicists that ever-ever existed, the big Foundations themselves; and, we're so used to it, we're so used to their programmes on television and their expert panels and so on, that now that it's all out in the open that they want to change society itself and the very types of humans that we are in fact. They've declared that there's too many of the base types left, that's the majority, according to them, and they want to rebuild the whole planet and vastly reduce the population and that's what all the hype is about, about sustainable

development, it's just another cover for massive depopulation which was always the agenda of the Eugenics Societies.

As I say, they're out in the open now and they could only come out in the open, in an age where the public have been so dumbed down and so used to their propaganda, never realising that it was propaganda. We've watched all the nature shows and gradually, bit by bit, we've been shown that this is how it is in nature: every animal feeds on some other animal and the fittest survive, the strongest survive. The weak and the elderly die off and all this kind of stuff. They started to show things even going further in nature, a few years ago, where they'd actually show you the animals killing each other, which was a first. I remember seeing one of the first ones. That again was to get it through our thick heads that we're just another animal and there's too many of us; and, then of course, the other programmes that would augment those kind of programmes were the expert talk shows talking about baby boomers coming to age and we just can't cope with it economically and all this kind of stuff.

That's why it's all out in the open now, because we've all been brainwashed, by osmosis, as they call it. I think it was Huxley and others said that the general public don't really think or reason things out; they simply absorb information and opinions that are given to them, by osmosis. When you think about how much bombardment we've had of data, our whole lives long, from your regular music shows on radio and the ads in between and the comments in between and the little talks they give in between. We've all been brainwashed in a thousand different ways, to accept the fact that everything now is in our face; and, most people, unfortunately, do accept it. I've had relatives of mine, over the years, who have watched all these programmes and they say "yeah, I guess there's too many of us" and I always say to them "well are you going to be the first to go? Will you volunteer?". I'll be back with more after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix and I have been discussing how we've all been brainwashed. The beautiful technique of brainwashing generally means that those who are the victims never know it, that's why it's very successful.

We live in a scientifically-indoctrinated age, an age where, literally, the sciences were developed to do with groups and I've been talking about Neuroscience and all the different branches of Neuroscience, which goes right into genetics by the way, and eugenics and how we've all been studied; the studies are ongoing. Most of the studies today, on people and the groups they will join, are done on chat rooms. Many people in the chat rooms don't know they're part of big experiments and they break them down into dyads, sub-types, personality types and so on. That's why it's so easy for someone who's put in as an agitator, to get the mob going against someone else. These are experiments and I've had a few of these experiments pulled on me, over the years, always from the same group, from one particular forum.

I know every single one of them and so do the police; because, lately, I've had threats from the same group again. This group even had the gall to put up a fake website, with my name on it, at one point; and, you turn to the first page and the first link took you off to someone, I know his real name, called Andrew and it was an anti-Semitic rant. That was tried on me before; and, now, the same character has got the mob all geared up to try and harass me. So, I have to warn you, every single one of you, on the website, is being monitored by the cops; because, you see, malicious intent and threats are taken seriously and I take threats against myself and my life and my dog very seriously. Let that be a warning to all of you, in your own states of locked-up paranoia.

Now, I hate to even go off in that direction, but that's what you get when you start to get known. If you're not saying the kind of things that they want you to say, or you're not agreeing with their a particular spin on something, they'll come after you, that's the mob; and, most of them, as I say, are just that, they're the mob. They don't think and they're easily riled up by someone who knows the techniques, so they're the fronts. They're disposable, at the end of the day.

Getting back to my topic, on how everything is in our face today. You can't win in this system if you try to fight it by using the system. I said that years ago, years ago when I was on Jackie Patru's show. You'll find that the help that's out there, government help and so on, the agencies, that are supposed to help you for complaints and so on, don't really exist, at least not the way you thought they did, not the way it's portrayed on television, when you have a big complaint about something that's affecting you personally, your house, your property, whatever it happens to be. Nothing has changed and we're in a big mess now, because the public are not organised. I was reading an article, in fact, from one of these Neuroscientists who said that very thing, he said:

"The public have no direction; they have no vision as to where they're going".

It's true, only organised, massive organised educated groups know where they're going; and, that's why you can't fight them, from a thousand million different fronts, and you can't fight them head on, because they always come to compromise and when you compromise you have to step backward one pace and that will followed by another one down the road. That's how it works.

Every country, right now, is being fleeced to give up its sovereignty and the big purse that's being used at the end, that's what's happening now. Why oh why, would they be pushing ahead with all the Kyoto Treaties and all of the massive amount of money they're going to rip from the public's pockets, to pay for it all, at a time when we're going into and we are really in a depression, we're going into a depression pretty fast? There's already talk that, once Obama gets in, there's a second bail-out package to be pushed out there and that all comes from the taxpayers as well. Taxes are going to skyrocket in the US very quickly.

Don't believe in their bringing things back to what we thought was normal; normal never returns again; normal is always back in the past somewhere, amongst all the other normals that preceded it. When you understand how these people work, the game plan and how they work, these characters always make a step forward, getting us to accept their particular treaties and then they change it a bit, as they go along and we go along with them. This is from the Chicago Tribune; it's to do with Canada's forests. Now, Canada had all the big forest land down as a carbon sink, what they call a carbon sink where they give off oxygen etc and give rid of the CO₂ with all the trees, 1/7th of the world's trees they claimed, at the time. They would pay for all the other carbon taxes for all our energy resources and so on. And here's from, as I say, the Chicago Tribune:

Canada's forests, once huge help on greenhouse gases, now contribute to climate change.

Canada's vast forest, once huge absorbers of the gases, now act as a problem. By Howard Witt Tribune correspondent January the 2nd 2009

Forestry officials in British Columbia used a controlled fire to check the spread of a devastating infestation by the mountain pine beetle.

That's from Reuters which they were showing was 2005, so they're pulling an old photograph. Now, the pine beetle goes up and down like a yo-yo, depending on the seasons that you're in. It depends too if you're going through a few years of a hot spell, or a few years of a cold spell, they die off in a cold spell. We're going through the cold spell now, because weather is never ever static. It says:

VANCOUVER ? As relentlessly bad as the news about global warming seems to be, with ice at the poles

Again, they're using the old data.

with ice at the poles melting faster than scientists had predicted and world temperatures rising higher than expected, there was at least a reservoir of hope stored here in Canada's vast forests. The country's 1.2 million square miles of trees have been dubbed the "lungs of the planet"

Once again, they get a picture in your mind so you can identify with something

"lungs of the planet" by ecologists because they account for more than 7 percent of Earth's total forest lands. They could always be depended upon to suck in vast quantities of carbon dioxide, naturally cleansing the world of much of the harmful heat-trapping gas.

Which, again, is all BS, because carbon dioxide is a natural component of our atmosphere. It says here:

But not anymore. In an alarming yet little-noticed series of recent studies,

Recent studies mind you.

scientists have concluded that Canada's precious forests, stressed from damage caused by global warming, insect infestations and persistent fires, have crossed an ominous line and are now pumping out more climate-changing carbon dioxide than they are sequestering.

It says here:

Worse yet, the experts predict that Canada's forests will remain net carbon sources, as opposed to carbon storage "sinks," until at least 2022, and possibly much longer.

Now, it means that Canada's going to have pay more money out, for having all these trees, which they claim now are a danger. There's no pleasing these guys, you can't, can you? I mean, they can churn out as much bogus science as they want, forever.

"We are seeing a significant distortion of the natural trend," said Werner Kurz, senior research scientist at the Canadian Forest Service and the leading expert on carbon cycles in the nation's forests. "Since 1999, and especially in the last five years, the forests have shifted from being a carbon sink to a carbon source."

Translation:

This is, again, the use of a picture you can sort of identify with.

Earth's lungs have come down with emphysema. Canada's forests are no longer our friends.

The trees now are bad guys.

So serious is the problem that Canada's federal government effectively wrote off the nation's forests in 2007 as officials submitted their plans to abide by the international Kyoto Protocol, which obligates participating governments to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.

We've written that off, it means we're to pay for it now.

Under the Kyoto agreement, governments are permitted to count forest lands as credits, or offsets, when calculating their national carbon emissions. But Canadian officials, aware of the scientific studies showing that their forests actually are emitting excess carbon, quietly omitted the forest lands from their Kyoto compliance calculations. "The forecast analysis prepared for the government ... indicates there is a probability that forests would constitute a net source of greenhouse gas emissions," a Canadian Environment Ministry spokesman told the Montreal Gazette. Canadian officials say global warming is causing the crisis in their forests. Inexorably rising temperatures are slowly drying out forest lands, leaving trees more susceptible to fires, which release huge amounts of carbon into the atmosphere.

Well, guess who's been setting most of the fires? It's the Forestry Commission; and that's been in all the papers. We had them in British Columbia a few years ago, and they wiped out whole towns, lumbering towns and everything. Then it turned out, about two years later, they admitted that they started the fires and they'd got out of control; but that's holy smoke. When they put all that smoke in the atmosphere, it's holy smoke when government does it; when you do it, it's bad. I'll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt we're Cutting Through The Matrix, going over an article from the Chicago Tribune, on how Canada's forests are giving off more – supposedly – carbon dioxide than they're taking in. This is what they're telling us now; and, of course they're still using the old data that we're going through our global warming cycle, when we're actually going through a cooling cycle, and have been for a few years, but what's the facts got to with an agenda? It says:

Bitter cold Canadian winters used to kill off much of the pine beetle population each year, naturally keeping it in check. But the milder winters of recent years

I don't know where they're getting this from.

have allowed the insect to proliferate. "That's what's causing some of our forests to switch from a carbon sink position to a source position," said Jim Snetsinger, British Columbia's chief forester. "Once those infested trees are killed by the pine beetle, they are no longer sequestering carbon – they are giving it off." Snetsinger noted that eventually, over the course of a generation, some of the dying forests will begin to regenerate and once again begin storing more carbon than they release. But for the foreseeable future, experts say, their models

Now, they're using computer models again, which always give them the answers they want

show that Canada's forests will stay stuck in a vicious global-warming cycle,

Even though we're in global cooling, again, but what does the facts matter here.

both succumbing to the effects of climate change and, as they decay and release more carbon, helping to accelerate it.

That's starting a whole new debate over commercial logging, which is one of Canada's biggest industries; and then the environmentalists are jumping in top of it too and everyone's getting in on the act of this shenanigan, as I call it, because that's what it is, it's a shenanigan.

Now, years ago, and since then, I've been talking about the United Nations and how it was set up to be a big front organisation for all of this agenda, to bring in the world system. H.G. Wells wrote about it in The Open Conspiracy. He wrote about it too, once they started off the League of Nations, he said now we can bypass elected politicians and, literally, bureaucrats and agencies within bureaucrats can, basically, talk to other bureaucrats, at the United Nations, and by-pass the political process altogether. Well, that's happened and that became, of course, the United Nations; and, remember who funded the United Nations into existence: the Rockefellers put up the land that it was built on, in New York, and they were the heads of the American Eugenics Society and had laws set out at that time, which they pushed and got into effect, where they were sterilising what they called "The feeble minded" and just the wrong types, by law.

I also mentioned that the United Nations, with its Department of Food & Agriculture, have eventually the mandate to handle all of the world's food supply and they will dish it out, proportion it out to the different nations, or 'states' as they like to call them, or 'regions' and the whole idea is that you don't get an increase if your population increases, in fact, it will decrease. It will decrease because they'll tell you this is the limit and in a few years later, they'll say we'll have to drop the limit, we don't have enough food and it's up to each country then to find a way to, basically, eliminate so much of the population. That's in their programme, read it up for yourselves, read the history of it up for yourselves too, it's a lot of work.

This is from the Mail Online and it's January the 5th 2009:

Britain 'must set population limit to safeguard national security' say experts.

The experts again.

By Daily Mail Reporter.

It says here:

Britain must set a maximum population level if it is to avoid destroying the environment

Here's the environment coming into it.

and putting national security at risk, say experts.

Now listen:

The Optimum Population Trust

Very important organisation that's not based just in Britain, they now have them all over, in every country, so the Optimum Population Trust

has written to ministers calling for a policy of 'zero net migration' – matching numbers allowed into Britain each year to numbers leaving.

It goes beyond that, because, when Margaret Thatcher was in, as the Prime Minister, she said she had to open the doors to immigration, wide-open, because the people had obeyed their government's instructions and been very good and had their 1.2 children etc and she said there weren't enough children getting born to pay off the national debt, that was the reason for opening the doors to massive immigration. It says here:

The UK's population is projected to increase

Again, this is the UN with its scare tactics, it's always fear-mongering with its statistics and so on

To increase from 60 to 70million over the next 20 years, and to 85million by 2081.

Now, that would only happen with massive immigration, because the population's there are drastically declining, according to the other set of figures you get from the United Nations and from Britain itself.

Experts are demanding a Royal Commission to establish 'an environmentally sustainable level

Here again: sustainability!

of population. The trust

It's a Foundation.

The trust, a panel of academics and environmentalists, says achieving zero net migration would cut Britain's population in 2081 to 57million. Mass immigration 'feeds through into rising greenhouse gas emissions' and more congestion, the experts say.

These unnamed experts.

I'll be back with more of this, after this break, to tie it in with the previous article.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix and I'm tying different articles together, to show you the pattern how it all works together, to shape our minds. Because, before, I mentioned an article about sustainable development; and, I mentioned too how the United Nations would eventually dish out the food to the countries, that was always its mandate when it was set up; and this article here, which is from the Mail Online, talking about, it's actually from the Optimum Population Trust, they call themselves. It says here:

The trust, a panel of academics and environmentalists, says achieving zero net migration would cut Britain's population in 2081 to 57million. Mass immigration 'feeds through into rising greenhouse gas emissions' and more congestion, the experts say.

Then he goes on to the other kicker, it ties in you see:

The trust warns that because Britain can produce only 30 per cent of the food, energy and other goods that it needs, it will become increasingly vulnerable to 'resource nationalism' as foreign powers hoard their own scarce resources.

This is all leading to who's going to dish out the food and Britain's been whacked just as much as every other Western country, by the government putting the farmers out of business, in collusion with the bankers, in order that the big Agri-food businesses can, basically, run the world's food supply.

'This imperils future national security

It's national security that's coming into it. Remember what Kissinger said? In that document that he signed in, in collusion with Britain, in 1974, that over-population was the number one enemy of the State and then a whole bunch of programmes went into effect, right away. They even had a list of countries they want to bring the populations down on, by all means possible; and you can find it, I have it here in fact. It says:

'This imperils future national security as well as destroying the environment,' it says. The trust is demanding a Royal Commission

That's a government Commission.

to establish 'an environmentally sustainable level of population'.

Now, there you go, it's right there: a Royal Commission to establish 'an environmentally sustainable level of population'. And, you know, if the public accept this, which they will, they'll sort of dream through this and there'll be another report in a year's time that that didn't go far enough, they'll bring it down even lower, the numbers down lower.

The Home Office said its new points-based immigration system would help manage immigration, 'which will contribute to future population projections and control'.

That's from the Mail Online. Now, who is the Optimum Population Trust? What is it? It says here, on their own website:

The Optimum Population Trust is the leading think tank in the UK concerned with the impact of population growth on the environment. OPT

As it calls itself,

research covers population in relation to climate change, energy, resources, biodiversity,

There's your Maurice Strong's one again.

development impacts, ageing and employment and other environmental and economic issues.

Ageing's in there remember, ageing! They don't like children and they don't like the very old, that's obvious.

It campaigns for stabilisation and gradual population decrease globally and in the UK. OPT is a registered charity

It's a registered charity.

and is financed by its members. It receives funding neither from the government

Oh-ho.

nor from any political or business interests

And these big Foundations are always classed as 'non-political'; in fact, if you look into any of the books put out by the Council on Foreign Relations, or the Royal Institute of International Affairs, they'll always tell you on the front page, this is a non-political organisation. They're telling the truth, they don't play politics: they make agendas and they tell governments what to do. They don't play politics. It says they're:

not affiliated with any other organisation.(Except as a partner in the Global Footprint Network.)

Look that one up for a radical. It says:

MAIN AIMS

To advance the education of the public in issues relating to human population worldwide and its impact on environmental sustainability;

To advance, promote and encourage research to determine optimum and ecologically sustainable human population levels

There you go, right there, that's exactly from the United Nations.

in all or any part or parts of the world and to publicise the results of such research;

To advance environmental protection by promoting policies in the United Kingdom or any other part or parts of the world which will lead or contribute to the achievement of stable human population levels which allow environmental sustainability.

Well, we've all seen Georgia Guidestones, we know what they're figures eventually could be reduced down to, over a long period of time; and, who are the patrons of this? Who are the patrons?

Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta,

Frank Ramsey Professor of Economics, University of Cambridge.

We've heard of this one.

Professor Paul Ehrlich, Professor of Population Studies, Stanford University.

Did you know that Jane Goodall was in it?

Jane Goodall PhD DBE, Founder, Jane Goodall Institute, and UN Messenger of Peace.

United Nations messenger of peace. And it has other ones:

Susan Hampshire OBE, Actress and population campaigner; Professor John Guillebaud Former Co-chair of OPT, Emeritus Professor of Family Planning and Reproductive Health,

That's abortions.

University College, London. Former Medical Director, Margaret Pyke Centre for Family Planning.

Abortion clinics.

Professor Aubrey Manning OBE, Emeritus Professor of Natural History, University of Edinburgh

Professor Norman Myers CMG, Visiting Fellow, Green College, Oxford University, and at Universities of Harvard, Cornell, Stanford, California, Michigan and Texas

They get around these guys, don't they?

Sara Parkin OBE, Founder Director and Trustee of Forum for the Future

Here's another one, see how they all tie in together, there's hundreds of them, all working together.

and Director of the Natural Environment Research Council and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education and Head Teachers into Industry.

Jonathon Porritt CBE, Founder Director of Forum for the Future and Chairman of the UK Sustainable Development Commission.

These all sound awful-awful like they work for government, but these are all private organisations, that tell governments what to do. See, this is the real democracy: they tell governments what to do. They're big segments of society, well-funded, massive lobby groups and here's the kicker, this is a winner, a sweetheart, this guy:

Sir Crispin Tickell GCMG KCVO, Chancellor of Kent University, Director of the Policy Foresight Programme at the James Martin Institute, and former UK Permanent Representative on the United Nations Security Council

That was by the Government; so, the government is completely immersed with the stuff; and, Tickell, if you read his different speeches, he's no laughing matter. Tickell Tickell Tickell, let's have a look at Tickell here, if I can find him, this is another one that adds right into this too, I'll do Tickell in a minute, if I can find him. It says:

Poll of international experts by The Independent, January the 2nd 2009.

Poll of international experts by The Independent reveals consensus that CO2 cuts have failed.

Listen to this:

and their growing support for technological intervention

You see, the global warming's fallen flat on its face, so they're falling back on CO2

By Steve Connor, Science Editor and Chris Green

An emergency "Plan B" using the latest technology is needed to save the world from dangerous climate change, according to a poll of leading scientists

You know that polls were first carried out by the Tavistock Institute, during World War One, because, what they found was they couldn't get enough guys to join and go off and get killed in the war, which they didn't understand anyway, and so they brought massive campaigns on, to do polling and they gave all these fake statistics out, knowing that the mass of people will go along with what they think is the majority opinion. That's a fact, unfortunately, people do. That's what they used for their polls; so, any poll is very suspicious. It says:

The collective international failure to curb the growing emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) in the atmosphere has meant that an alternative to merely curbing emissions may become necessary. The plan would involve highly controversial proposals to lower global temperatures artificially through daringly ambitious schemes that either reduce sunlight levels by man-made means or take CO2 out of the air.

This "geoengineering" approach – including schemes such as fertilising the oceans with iron to stimulate algal blooms – would have been dismissed as a distraction a few years ago but is now being seen by the majority of scientists we surveyed as a viable emergency backup plan that could save the planet from the worst effects of climate change,

From the weather you know.

at least until deep cuts are made in CO2 emissions.

Now, they also talk about seeding the planet with, again, the metallic particles in the air and even sulphur. Isn't it amazing that they're bringing this out now when they've already been doing that for over ten years, world-wide, in some parts, daily? Such as here where I live? It says here:

What has worried many of the experts, who include recognised authorities from the world's leading universities and research institutes, as well as a Nobel Laureate, is the failure to curb global greenhouse gas emissions through international agreements, namely the Kyoto Treaty, and recent studies indicating that the Earth's natural carbon "sinks" are becoming less efficient at absorbing man-made CO₂

Man-made CO₂, from the atmosphere.

Levels of CO₂ have continued to increase during the past decade since the treaty was agreed and they are now rising faster than even the worst-case scenarios from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a United Nations body.

That's all these hired whore scientists that are getting their pay cheques on this, life-long if they can keep it going, and churn out all these false studies, from their specially-made computers that gives them all the things they want to hear.

In the meantime, the natural absorption of CO₂ by the world's forests and oceans has decreased significantly.

Here they are, talking about doing all these weird things to remove CO₂ from the atmosphere, massive things. Now, you know yourself, as I say, they've been spraying the skies for donkey's years now and it's had its toll on the effects, the physical effects on humans. There's never been a time when there's so much bronchial problems ever. In a time when all our industry's gone, they're not pushing smoke out of big chimneys. The industry's all off in China and they're still harping on about too much pollution but they've changed it now to CO₂, something's that's an invisible gas that's always there naturally. However, they won't stop, as I say, until they've got what they want; and, unfortunately, they, being the biggest organisations, with a ready-willing media to take them up on it, we'll never ever get to a complete truth on anything.

Going back to Mr. Crispin, this beautiful sweetheart, as I say, is no laughing matter, or Tickell, his name is Sir Crispin Tickell. He says, this is from an old document, but it gives you an idea who he is, from the 7th of September 1991:

Talking Point: What we must do to save the planet.

He's been on the go for a long time with this you see, getting well-paid for it.

The world faces a growing list of problems: overpopulation, dwindling resources, environmental degradation, industrial pollution,

That's before all the industry went totally.

ozone depletion, global warming and the rest. It is already too late to avert them. But we can still mitigate some of their effects and prepare ourselves for a different sort of world.

Again, change is good right?

Over the last 20 years, there has been some progress towards this goal. A remarkable change in public awareness

That's all we've had is propaganda

has led individuals, groups, governments and international bodies in their different ways to take the first steps towards wisdom. These are to recognise that these problems exist,

I should say BELIEVE, I should insert BELIEVE in there, because it's a belief system.

and to begin – albeit in piecemeal fashion – to do something about them.

But in relation to the size and scope of the issues, we have hardly started. We are still at the beginning of the beginning, and must learn not only to behave differently but to think differently. This is most difficult of all, is to acquire ...

assumptions to change habits create new models of thought, accept different values and see the world through other eyes.

What they're talking about, we've all got to see it through their eyes and think the way they do, that's what they mean by 'changing consciousness' / public awareness.

To change our way of thinking we first need to recast our vocabulary.

That's what they do; they use Psycho-linguistics and use slogans.

Words are the building bricks of thought, instruments of economic analysis are blunt and rusty; terms such as growth development, cost-benefit analysis and even gross national product have come to be misleading. They are more than ripe for redefinition. Secondly, we need to realise that conventional wisdom is sometimes a contradiction in terms. Some trends, for example the consumption of non renewable resources point in the wrong direction. But, as the French writer Rene Dubois said: where ever human beings are concerned, the trend is not destiny, nothing is inevitable unless we make it so.

They want to, how they worded it, make it so, that's what they say at the end of some of the Occult ceremonies.

At the end, there's a need to change our culture, the division between the cultures of science and the arts so rightly decried, but neither culture is now in charge.

You see: they want the scientists to be in charge.

Our real bosses are the business managers, even two centuries ago, Edmund Burke feared of the age Sophisters, economists and calculators had come. Our problem is that our calculations are usually short-term. Finally, we need a value system which enshrines the principle of sustainable development.

This is not a recent term, this is 1991.

The concept can mean different things to different people but the idea behind it is simple: you must devise models for relatively steady state society.

There you are, from '91 to 2009, from that Optimum Trust I've just read, here's the same character, running the whole thing, never changing one iota. He says:

In which population size in broad balance with the availability of resources.

Now, who is this character, this Crispin Tickell? At that time Sir Crispin Tickell is warden of Green College Oxford and was, until recently, British Ambassador to the United Nations.

This article was based on an address delivered to last week's meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

That's from Issue 1785 of New Scientist Magazine 7th of September 1991, page 16.

You can see how they've been at this for a long-long time and we've all read so many articles, or at least headlines and little bits on television, bits and bites because that's how we learn today, bits and bites and we're all prepared for them coming out in the open, to direct and order our lives for us. I'll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt, Cutting Through The Matrix and there's one last article I want to touch on here, it goes into the same topic, because we've been in a war and most of us never ever knew it, you simply grow up within it, thinking everything is quite natural. If your parents don't know to warn you, it won't dawn on you there's anything wrong. This is from truthdig.com, it's a book review by Tony Platt on American Eugenics. Posted June the 20th 2008. He says:

The 1942 U.S. Supreme Court case of Skinner v. Oklahoma is remembered for protecting "the right to have offspring,"

We forget that that this has all been done before, the right, people had to fight to have the right to have offspring

and by implication the right not to have offspring. Skinner, according to Victoria Nourse, the author of an important new book on American eugenics, typically "sits in the shadow of the abortion and gay marriage debates."

"In Reckless Hands: Skinner v. Oklahoma and the Near-Triumph of American Eugenics" demonstrates that Skinner also opens a window into a little-known chapter of American eugenics: how prisoners at a hardscrabble prison in Oklahoma in the aftermath of the Depression led a sophisticated struggle to limit the practice of compulsory sterilization in the United States.

Now, most people in the prisons in the 1920s were in there for stealing food, believe it or not, because there was no work anywhere. Everybody literally lost the farm. It says:

Much has been written about the history of eugenics, but until publication of this book we knew little about how eugenic sterilization was used in prisons and against men, and even less about the views of

its targeted victims. It's a lively tale, well told, until the author, a law professor at Emory University, tries her hand at historical generalizations.

At the core of eugenics was a belief in a central role of heredity in both determining and explaining social inequality.

I've told you about the Poverty Gene, also called the Criminal Gene.

Influenced by 19th-century developments in genetics, medicine and public health, eugenics was not a crank science. At the height of its influence, support came from some unlikely ideological bedfellows. It was endorsed by Fabian socialists in England and racial scientists in Germany; linked to birth control and progressive economic reforms in Denmark, and to racial policies against itinerant gypsies in Sweden; an expression of Fascist ideology in Germany and Argentina, and of cultural hybridity in Mexico; and closely associated with the sterilization of those defined as "feebleminded" in Germany, the United States, Sweden and Denmark.

By the way, it was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, primarily in the United States. The same Rockefeller Foundation that's leading the charge for the global society, the specific depopulated global society.


In the 1930s, Nazi Germany made eugenics an official state policy, first openly sterilizing hundreds of thousands of women, then secretly murdering many of its disabled and mentally ill patients judged leading "lives unworthy of life." Until the onset of World War II, when selective murder turned into organized butchery, Nazi racial scientists were appreciated around the world

That's true; Adolf Hitler was Time-Life Man of the Year twice in the 1930s. It says he was:

appreciated around the world, especially in the United States, where eugenics was dominated by right-wing hard-liners.

I can hear the music coming in, so I'm afraid that's a very fast show, it just zoomed in there. It's a very good article to read and I'll put the link on my site, after the show.

From Hamish and myself in Ontario Canada, it's goodnight and may your god, or your gods go with you.



Alan
Keymaster
(127.0.0.1)

That's the hardest part, I guess, is trying to make sense of your own lifetime; it's tough enough going over history, which has always been rewritten. In our own age, this age we're in now, so much history has gone down the memory hole, as George Orwell called it in 1984. Because we're not supposed to know how people were managed in the past and how the big-big cons were pulled on people, by those in power, that's so they can always pull the same cons again, if we don't know, they'll do it again and again. They do the same cons every generation now, because the generations are split up: you don't have grandmothers and great grandmothers and fathers living with families, or even in touch with families any more, so they don't pass on this information to the young, therefore, the same scams can be pulled over and over; and, we fall for them. It's like Plato said, basically, Plato was saying that everything's a formula, if you want the public to behave or react or direct them in a certain direction, you simply use formula. That formula which has been used before will work again, if implemented in the same sequence as before; and there are sciences to do with this, which are not taught to the general population. You find that Bernays, and other people I'm sure, were taught them by various secretive societies where archives are kept, archives of histories, not only of one or two countries but pretty well of all the major countries and empires down through the ages. They use these techniques to their advantage, to help mould the future and the future which is being moulded today, especially this century, is called the age of transition. That's change, change is everywhere, that's the name of it, change and transition; and, I'm always a bit wary of anything with 'transition' in it, because, even the ones that seem to be opposing this often have their leaders supplied. Even some of the documentaries I've mentioned, you have to be very careful because you'll find the same champions of, supposedly, freedoms, on every different one. They're taken as the specialists, even in Britain; so be very-very careful about these documentaries; because you find when you oppose them head-on, you're simply working in the dialectic and you can't win using their technique, you're on their chessboard. I'll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt, we're Cutting Through The Matrix and discussing this incredible system we're living in. It truly is so interwoven and so well directed that it's difficult, it's like looking through a very tightly-woven cloth, trying to see through the other side, because all the big Foundations, thousands of non-governmental organisations, all funded by these Foundations, and various governmental agencies are all working in concert to bring in what they all know is an age of transition, or change as they call it. As they keep chanting 'change is good', remember what Lenin said: we shall win by slogans, this repetition of slogans. Those that prattle off slogans seldom know what they really mean, they don't reason them through, they just rattle them off and they're the sheep that George Orwell has in his Animal Farm that say "Four legs good, two legs bad"; and, once it changes to "Two legs good, four legs bad", they don't know the difference.

What is change? What's the change they're talking about? It's the change of an entire world society into, not only a new way of living, earning your keep you might say, but literally being born in order to serve a world state. Since all of these agencies, this combined mesh of power – that rules over people – have decided that everyone, pretty well, beneath them (of course) is mentally ill. In fact, anyone who won't go along, or disagrees with this agenda, or any single part of the agenda, is – to them, obviously – mentally-ill and should be rectified. They have all these plans to do it, when they give themselves, which they're already doing, the right to come into the womb, literally, and insert various genes, you know, improved genes, into the foetus, so as you won't be a throwback to a primitive man. You might have some anti-social tendencies, if you were allowed to just be born the way you were conceived, you were initially started off; and, this is all agreed upon at the top, but they also agree that the world they're bringing in is a world where there will be no private property, it's based on the old Plato's idea of The Republic, this Utopia of theirs, where all the intellectual intelligentsia elite will, basically, be given great big palaces to live in, courtesy of the workers, who will keep it up to scratch and replenish it and repair it and so on. That way they won't have to technically own anything. That was the basis, remember, of the Soviet Union; and, as Orwell also said: "Some are more equal than others in such utopias". We know that the Politburo and their families lived an equivalent lifestyle to any high bureaucrat in the Western World, same kind of income, they had access to all the luxuries of the West. They also had the Dachas in the country where they'd go and relax, with servants attending them, just like nobility in Europe.

This is the system they're bringing in and they've already decided a long time ago they would not need so many people using up the world's resources, as they say, because the intelligentsia also decided, at meetings – and they had world meetings back in the 1800s about this. Go into the founding of the Fabian Society and you'll find out that they did literally mean that they were going to hammer the world into shape, on an anvil, the proper shape, the way it should be, according to them; and, they've been heavily at work ever since, doing so. Big-big money came into the Fabian Society, big money. The Astors came over to Britain and became Lord and Lady Astor and they funded it too and the money that they had in those days, many millions of dollars would make them billionaires, many of them, a few times over today. It's never explained why there was an interest of these very wealthy people who obviously didn't get their money by playing fair, no one does. They wanted to come over and – supposedly – help the working classes, but it had nothing to do with helping the working classes; it was, again, a scientific agenda: there was too much poverty; therefore you had to get rid of the poor. Meanwhile, the Fabian Society became the champion of Labour, or the Left Wing, which is just the same thing as Liberal in other countries. It's all deception, you have one hand basically, one body, using one hand on one side and it's using its other hand on the other. That's the dialectic that we get caught up in – and, most people never get out of – they pick sides and so many studies have been done on this, on how people pick sides, it's unbelievable.

I can remember reading years ago, when they talked about the coming information wars and how Internet, especially, would give access to so many people to start to disintegrate the planned society, the

one that was already planned to go ahead, and how they'd combat that. They had studies done on how groups are formed, even in cyberspace, before they gave us cyberspace, because this work had already been Marshall McLuhan, Professor Marshall McLuhan, and others, into how we perceive things and McLuhan himself said that an age was coming, back in the '60s, an age would come, and it already was there, to one extent, through telephone itself, where you're talking to people across the world that you never see, you are, in a sense, a voice with the body left behind in some kind of electronic space, just floating around talking to other voices and he predicted that this would become more and more real for people, as the unattached voices become more real than the people living next to them. Well, this is actually happening in our lifetime and, again, those big powerful organisations moved into this whole sphere because that was their territory: how to control the mind through altering perception.

I've said before: if you fight them, the way that you normally fight them, you're done for because they've already worked out, by, they call it Neuroscience, it's a neuroscience technique, of how groups are formed, how friendships are formed over the Internet in fact. And, from the very beginning, going back to that article I read years ago, on the coming information wars, where they said they'd insert Trojan Horses right into chat rooms and so on, who'd be trained to have maybe five different identities; and, none of the other people would know that one person had five identities, they'd think that this was all different people and this one would stir up, when a group started to get power, or at least get information shared amongst them, and a common agenda linked up, this person would then start to grumble and say 'so and so said this about you'. Then you'd email it back to this other person, not realising it was the same person, being five different names; and, they were trained to do this and they're all over the place, that's why I never go into forums. You can't, you can't do it.

Everything that happens in our lifetime is planned before we're given the vehicles for making it even happen. There's an article, it's from TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences Vol.9 No.1 January 2005. It's well worth looking into, by Martha J. Farah, Center for Cognitive Neuroscience, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA. It goes into the Introduction, if you scroll down the page, it says:

Almost three decades ago, in the picturesque coastal retreat of Asilomar, California, a group of molecular biologists gathered to discuss the safety of the newly developed recombinant DNA technology. In the years since, concern about the risks of genetic engineering have remained prominent in the public consciousness, as well as commanding the attention of academic bioethicists,

That's eugenicists basically.

government regulators, and biologists themselves. At the start of the 21st century, neuroscience has developed to a point where it, too, may have profound effects on society, extending far beyond the research laboratory or medical clinic. Like the field of genetics, neuroscience concerns the biological

foundations of who we are, of our essence. The relation of self to brain is, if anything, more direct than that of self to genome. Perhaps more important, neural interventions are generally more easily accomplished than genetic interventions. Yet until recently there has been little awareness of the ethical issues arising from neuroscience.

Now, maybe a few weeks ago, I read an article from a Professor in Holland on the subject too, that's really way ahead in its workings and its use upon the people, where he was discussing how this could be used, this science can be used to literally manipulate everyone's mind, on any topic, very easily. Getting back to this article, it says:

Neuroethics encompasses a large and varied set of issues, and initial discussions focused on various different subsets of those issues.

It goes on to say here:

Neuroethics encompasses a large and varied set of issues ... Some neuroethical issues concern the practical implications of neurotechnology for individuals and society. Technological progress is making it possible to monitor and manipulate the human mind with ever more precision through a variety of neuroimaging methods and interventions. For the first time it may be possible to breach the privacy of the human mind, and judge people not only by their actions, but also by their thoughts and predilections.

Understand: on the Internet, and I've read articles about this from the Military themselves, where they have a duplicate of every one of us in a virtual world, with all our habits, traits etc and they get all the information from us, voluntarily, via the Internet. Back, after these messages, with more.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix, reading an article about Neuroscience; and; this science is so far ahead, it's astonishing how far ahead they have gone with the various technologies involved. Before, they used to have just simple observation of people and lots of tricks to observe them too and I've read books from the '50s on advertising, I've read them on the air some of them, on how they used to study people to see how they shop and to see if certain colours or the way things are packaged would make people buy certain things and impulse buy and so on. We've always been studied for this, but this is way beyond this, it's right down to trying to break down you as a personality, in order to control you, to manipulate you in such a way that you won't even know that the ideas or thoughts in your head are not your own. I've talked about articles before where they have technology of direct voice to skull, it's

now used in advertising in New York at least, I don't know where else it's used, but that was in all the major newspapers. These are intrusive technologies, because who has the right to come right inside your skull and advise you to vote for someone or go and buy something in a store that's nearby? That's intrusive; and, don't forget that, don't ever believe for a minute that those in the Pentagon and those who control the minds of people and who are really interested in how to control people, like the CIA, don't think that haven't gone way behind that. Of course they have. In fact, over the weekend, I was looking at an article, it was on Google videos in fact, from major TV companies back in the '60s and '70s, doing exposés on even the old MK-ULTRA that was going on at the time, that went beyond using psychiatric hospitals and LSD and shock treatment. They were hiring, the CIA was running prostitutes across the country, with TV cameras in the rooms and the whole idea was to get the 'Johns' on taking various drugs and then observing the effects on them. At least, that's what they told the public and we still don't have access to all the kinds of drugs they were testing on these characters or what happened to these people.

I've always said you don't have to worry about the guys 'over there', whoever they are, wherever they happen to be, you worry about the guys in your own country, at the top, in the big secret societies, the kind that's called MI6 and CIA and Mossad. These are the guys you worry about, because they use everyone as a guinea pig and it could be you, me or anyone else and thousands of us. Their idea being to control millions of us.

Getting back to this article here, on Neuroscience. It says here:

Neuroscience is providing us with increasingly comprehensive explanations of human behavior in purely material terms. Although the field of neuroethics is young and still evolving rapidly, the time seems ripe for a review in which the key issues of neuroethics, both practical and philosophical, are surveyed and placed in relation to one another.

Remember: the CIA will be funding a lot of these programmes in the universities, as they always have done before.

Brain imaging and brain privacy

Among the neuroscience technologies that present new ethical challenges of a practical nature is functional brain imaging. This includes the familiar false-color images of positron emission tomography (PET) and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), as well as the electroencephalography-derived methods of event-related potentials (ERPs) and magnetoencephalography (MEG) and optical imaging methods such as near infrared spectroscopy (NIRS). These methods vary in their invasiveness and portability, which constrain the uses to which they can be put, although any one of them can be

used to obtain personal information surreptitiously, in a study ostensibly designed for a different purpose. In principle, and increasingly in practice, imaging can be used to infer people's psychological states and traits [1,3,7].

For example, in "neuromarketing" brain imaging is used to measure limbic system response to a product that may indicate consumers' desire for it.

Do you know that in the supermarkets they have tiny little fish eye cameras along shelves? They've had them since the '60s and they pick up the pupil, how it dilates or constricts when it sees a certain product and all that data's fed back into banks. We're all guinea pigs you see. It says here:

In one recent demonstration, brain activity related to soft drink preference was sensitive to both the taste of the drink and to the brand name

Then they go on about Coke and Pepsi.

...To the extent that neuroimaging can measure unconscious motivation to buy, it provides a valuable new kind of information for marketers. Another potential use for functional imaging of brain states is lie detection. Although fMRI-based lie detection is far from feasible in real-world situations,

Well, they're actually working on that now, as you know. Remote lie detection outfits are starting to put them in the airports and everything.

researchers have found correlates of deception in the laboratory [9]. ERPs come closer to providing actual brain-based lie detection. They have been used to identify 'guilty knowledge' by distinguishing responses to items that are generally known to be associated with a crime and items that only the perpetrator would know are associated [10]. An example is shown in Figure 1.

Anyway, they call it Brain Fingerprinting but they also go into, of course, sex and everything else and pleasant stimuli. Where did they get all this information on pleasant stimuli, well, they got it from testing on prisoners and sexual perverts in prison, showing them all these photographs and wiring them up, that's where they got all this data. I'll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt, we're Cutting Through The Matrix and I'm trying to, with the limited information that's available to any of us, at the bottom here, piece things together; and, I was thinking over the weekend too about an article I read recently of how, in Japan, they'd tapped in, and I said this a long time ago, this would be able to be done, they've tapped in to the signals coming from a person's eyes to the back of their brain, to the visual cortex, and, now they can actually see what the person's seeing, at least writing, they can actually write things down and see it on a computer. I'm sure that's been done, this has been done at the bottom, I'm sure it's been done at the top long ago. In fact, when Nick Begich first showed those devices on the Wendy Mesley show, in Canada, on television that the CIA had used in the 1950s, they could put thoughts in their head. Now, if they could put thoughts in your head, why couldn't they be able to read your thoughts as well, to an extent? If everything is electro-magnetic currents and so on, electro-chemical currents, giving off signals, I'm sure they're so far ahead in all of this area, from all of your senses, they pretty well decode them all and have an idea what's going on; and, I'm sure, that information is kept at the very-very hush secret systems way above even than the CIA, because their bosses would never give them the same kind of weaponry they have, you can believe that. Science has always at least, as far as I can see, held in three categories, for all of the sciences. That's the ones at the bottom that do research, the ones in the middle, like the CIA and some of the higher special forces that get higher technology to use; and, then the bosses above them and they have the stuff that's even way ahead of that.

We're given obsolete stuff at the bottom. All of this technology is well-funded, remember, scientists and the universities too, get grants to do research but they're told what to do it on; and, it's always of use to those in power, that's what everything is about, it's about power and control. Therefore, they fund particular programmes that they're really interested in and, naturally, this is a field they fund heavily, using our tax money, because, the future they have designed for us is to be a totally-surveyed society, surveilled society, a society where there is no privacy and a population that doesn't mind that. We have a generation growing up now who think it's quite natural to give out all your data to anyone who asks for it, even people on the Internet and websites and so on, they've got all their data there. They think privacy is of no value; they have no idea that wars were fought in the past to get some privacy. If you go back not so long ago, not so long ago, in the European countries, the king's men could smash your doors down at any time, haul you off the land, kick you off and there was no court in the land that would listen to your problems, it was just the king's law. He would steal anything from you he wished to do; they're back at that stage now, governments acting as the old kings do and the police can actually confiscate your property and share the loot amongst themselves because they copy the Soviet system and that's what that was based on.

Nothing really changes, except that the sciences they're using can fool us into the fact that we're into a nice cosy society and the sheep don't notice that the wolf has big fangs anymore, he's well camouflaged, he wears a suit and tie and looks rather nice, or he might talk about wild life programmes

on the television for you, to show you he loves animals and nature, as he brainwashes you that you're just another animal. That's how the sciences are being used.

Whatever is published to the public is fascinating enough, to know what they're doing at the bottom level; but you always keep in mind that what they're rediscovering at the bottom has been done at the top a long time ago and how far ahead they truly are and it's always, as I say, to do with power. Power is the name of the game and the continuity of power. The elite, down through the ages, have never voluntarily given up any power to anybody. This whole farce of democracy was their scam, to make us work along with it while they got to the stage we're at now where most folk don't really care much about democracy. In fact, it's become such a vague term, we don't know what it is anymore. It's pretty sad, because we're truly being used, not just like guinea pigs, they're beyond the guinea pig stage, we are the subjects now, not just the test subjects, they're using techniques on us and this is technotronic warfare the big boys like Brzezinski talked about in his book *Between Two Ages*.

Here's an article from cnn.com on the Technology page and it says here:

TEL AVIV, Israel (CNN) — Keep your shoes and belts on: Waiting in long airport security lines to pass through metal detectors may soon be a thing of the past.

You know, Israel has pretty well all the patents on all the security equipment. Most of the security equipment in Britain, and all through the big cities in England, are owned by Israeli companies. I was watching a series to do with the bombings in London, an amazing series that some guy put together, it's called 7/7 Ripple Effect. It's a seven-set series and this guy will take you painstakingly through all the inconsistencies of what the Government told the public and then he looks up the actual facts and matches them together. In that documentary, he goes into the companies who own all the cameras, the fact being, that in all the sites where the bombing practices were to take place, that happened to be the real bombings, which means that it was all set to be real bombings in the first place, the cameras just happened to be out of action that day but it was Israeli companies that owned them. Here we are again, Tel Aviv Israel talking about airport lines:

Security experts say focus is shifting from analyzing the content of carry-ons to analyzing the content of passengers' intentions and emotions. "We are seeing a needed paradigm shift when it comes to security," says Omer Laviv, CEO of ATHENA GS3, an Israeli-based security company. "This 'brain-fingerprinting,'

See, this is right into that neuroscience you see

or technology which checks for behavioral intent, is much more developed than we think." Nowhere is the need for cutting-edge security more acute than Israel, which faces constant security threats. For this reason, Israel has become a leader in developing security technology. Several Israeli-based technology companies are developing detection systems that pick up signs of emotional strain, a psychological red flag that a passenger may intend to commit an act of terror. Speedier and less intrusive than metal detectors, these systems may eventually restore some efficiency to the airplane boarding process.

They'll sell you any shmuck you see, shmuck I should say, for a profit, because these things can stop someone that's anxious, most folk going for a flight are anxious and tranquilisers will overcome that; and, even if you're a real terrorist, the tranquilisers would overcome that too. They're also flashing up certain words in different languages on a screen, subliminally, to see how you react and they scan your brain as they watch. You don't even know what's happening because they put them into ads, these different ads they have on the sides in airports. That's all intrusive and it's also deceitful, completely deceptive. They even have stuff built into the chairs you sit on, to see how your body's reacting to stress and so on. It's pretty-pretty disgusting what's really going on, but this is neuroscience and they're using gadgets now that can basically pick up your senses from a good distance. It's at the stage now where the police in police cars will soon get equipped to see if you're driving under stress. That'll be the next thing. This is the kind of society that's been brought in, a totally surveilled society. We have children now who are watching nothing but 'reality' shows and they see all these youngsters they think about the same age as themselves, they're just like them with cameras and they all want to be on TV. Have you ever wondered why these little cameras for your computer are so cheap? They're the cheapest part of everything, or anything, because they want everyone to buy them and put them in all their rooms, so that their little world is on view to the whole world; and, people are falling for this, especially the young. It's amazing what's really happening and it's all by design.

There's never been a power elite in history had so much, I mean really, they're just laughing themselves all over with glee at getting society trained to open their lives up for them to watch and see. It's never happened in history before. They don't have to force them to do it, it's all done by Neuroscientific persuasion and propaganda and repetition; and, the need for youngsters to belong to their peer group – to belong, it's very, very important to young people – every tyrant in history knows that. Hitler had the Hitler Youth; they had their young Communists in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. They always use the youth, who want to belong to something that gives them meaning; and, that's why too, they had an attack on the family. The same organisations that are running the world today said that they'd have to destroy the family, and then they could go straight for the minds of the youth. Those who were older were contaminated with their thoughts, their modes of behaviour, their morality was obsolete and a hindrance to progress, because they knew what progress was, they had it all in mind where they wanted to progress to. They had to eradicate all that was; and, they've done a darn good job of it.

Now, school and education, under UNESCO has stepped in and they're using UNESCO's mental health programme to test every single child on the planet, to see if they're mentally healthy enough to come into this new society; and, if not, what needs to be rectified about them. Remember: Julian Huxley was the first CEO of UNESCO and he was the brother of Aldous Huxley, who was the grandson of Sir Thomas Huxley and Sir Thomas Huxley was the best friend of Charles Darwin. Socialism and Behaviourism, all tie in together with the Fabian Society, it all works together, along the same path, The New Man.

One of the founders of the Fabian Society, George Bernard Shaw, was a guy with a strange history himself, because a lot of these characters are always brought up with a mother but no father. It's the mother that gives the indoctrination, because the mother belongs to certain societies, that's why they're given this indoctrination; but, George Bernard Shaw wrote Man and Superman, he was a founder of the Fabian Society. H.G. Wells, apparently, never saw his father, he was an alcoholic lower middle class character whose professional job was being an extra batter at cricket, so he toured playing cricket and getting paid for it, like a hired hand, something that Wells was ashamed of because he hated the working class, he was terrified of the working class in fact. These are the sort of characters that were picked, people with big chips on their shoulder, picked by the very-very wealthy, like the Astor family, to do all the leg work and all the typing work and all the speeches.

Then you had the Webbs as well, Beatrice and Sydney Webb, who laid out all the rules and the groundwork and did all the bureaucratic write-ups, very boring people and yet that's the system they created that we're living in today. That's what all bureaucracy is fashioned after, the methodology of Sydney and Beatrice Webb.

As I say: shortly there'll be nowhere to hide, the last refuge used to be your mind, inside your own mind and, short of walking about with a lead helmet on, that's rapidly disappearing. They won't be happy, they will not be happy, until they are into your brain; and, even then, once they're into your brain, because you can still make decisions, it's not good enough that you control your brain; they want to put a chip in there eventually, and control it for you. Then, they'll feel safe, because, any decision that you make, will be a decision that they've programmed into you; but, you can see where this all must go and what I'm talking about has been discussed in big-big powerful meetings.

The people at the top are very paranoid, terrified as well, that enough people can come out with the facts and shout quite loudly that the king has no clothes. All this farce about terrorism and so on, and the sky is falling and global warming and incoming comets or whatever it happens to be, is all bogus, to get us on the road to stampede and then they can lead us into this Brave New World, that's what it's all about, nothing less than that.

I was listening to Rumsfeld one day, when he was talking about a strange bunch of terms he was using, he says we know all about the knowns, then there are the unknowns that we know nothing about and we know that we know nothing about the unknowns. He went on and on and on and this comes from documents in the Pentagon, where their big intelligence teams are looking at every possible thing that gets churned out of computers on disasters. There's hundreds of them, it's like getting up in the morning and saying what can go wrong today and you tie your shoelaces and you tie them together and you fall on your face. Anything that could possibly happen and go wrong is part of this scenario and they're trying to cover every possible base, it's incredible, it's madness, it's utter madness at that level.

I always think back to Mao Tse-tung who said he wasn't afraid of armies, he was afraid of someone with an original idea, someone that could spread that original idea, because, you see, that's how Communism spread, in the first place. That's how Socialism spread, from an idea, from an individual. Those in power grabbed a hold of that idea, because they could use that technique, to control the people.

Always be careful of the groups that you join, because even if you start off with the best of intentions, people will infiltrate and be very helpful to you. In fact, there was a book, it's a handbook for that which is being used today called You Can Trust The Communists. If you can get a hold of it, read it through because it gives you the very strategies that are in use today. Where someone will come in and be the greatest secretary to your little club that you've ever had, before you know it, she'll work to the top and the next meeting she'll be voted in as the head and then she's off in different directions. I'll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix, doing a bit of a rant tonight over different topics but they're all connected, because the future doesn't just happen by itself, the present didn't come about by a bunch of separate incidents, just coalescing together, it was planned this way. In fact, the Fabian Society was named after the emperor who used certain delaying tactics, over long terms, to get his objective resolved.

I've just got time here to mention a few of the Fabian members of the Fabian Society, from their own website, past and present: Clement Attlee (UK Prime Minister 1945-51); Ed Balls (British MP); Tony Benn (the Benn family's been in this forever, radical left Labour MP); Annie Besant (remember, Theosophist, it says here Theosophist and social activist; Lord Besant was her father, mind you, he gave her a hand); Tony Blair (UK Prime Minister 1997-2007); David Blunkett (Home Secretary for the UK 2001-04); Gordon Brown (The present UK Prime Minister). There's a whole list of them, whole list of people, going down and down forever almost and that's not them all, that's just some of the better known ones. HG Wells and all

these guys of course are in there too and Ramsey McDonald, who was the head of state, first Labour Prime Minister of the UK, high Freemason, high Socialist and picked an odd name Ramsey. You have to look back into history to find out who was the first Ramsey that gave Ramsey's rant, interesting stuff. It's all connected together; it's not happenstance at all.

What's always amazed me though is how people can become so incredibly stuck on the groups that they come into; and, they never change their mind. You see, when we grow up, and we're always growing up, until you die. You're just starting to get something and you kick the bucket, that's the sadness about living.

These guys never changed, it's as though they were stuck with their views at 18 and didn't learn anything from then on and they're very adamant in their activism and the way they see things. That's an odd thing to happen, because you're supposed to mature, you have milestones throughout your life, as you acquire more knowledge and more wisdom about yourself and society; but, these guys don't, they're stuck there, their lives long. It's always astonished me; and, these characters, especially in societies like the Fabian Society, are hard-line, very hard line in their views and opinions.

When Tony Blair backed the US for this war on terror, you can bet your bottom dollar that the whole thing was planned, between higher powers on both sides of the Atlantic, before 9/11 went off; and, we know that for a fact and you have to say well these are very radical groups. Here's Tony Blair with the Fabian Society aligned with a guy and a bunch of guys from the Skull and Bones Society and it starts coming together, because the Fabian Society, although it champions, supposedly, Labour, at least it was known for that, that was never its intent. It was to lead the world into a brand new scientifically-controlled society where intellectuals would take their rightful place. You can go back to the writings of Jefferson and he said the world would be run by the natural nobility. That's what he meant by that and Jefferson was a member of those very high societies too.

Well, that's it for tonight folks. Sorry I couldn't take callers, so please call in again. From Hamish and myself in Ontario Canada, it's good night and may your god, or your gods, go with you.

October 22, 2025 at 7:42 am

EDIT | MOVE | SPLIT | TRASH | SPAM | UNAPPROVE | REPLY [#918](#)

That's the hardest part, I guess, is trying to make sense of your own lifetime; it's tough enough going over history, which has always been rewritten. In our own age, this age we're in now, so much history has gone down the memory hole, as George Orwell called it in 1984. Because we're not supposed to know how people were managed in the past and how the big-big cons were pulled on people, by those in power,



Alan
Keymaster
(127.0.0.1)

that's so they can always pull the same cons again, if we don't know, they'll do it again and again. They do the same cons every generation now, because the generations are split up: you don't have grandmothers and great grandmothers and fathers living with families, or even in touch with families any more, so they don't pass on this information to the young, therefore, the same scams can be pulled over and over; and, we fall for them. It's like Plato said, basically, Plato was saying that everything's a formula, if you want the public to behave or react or direct them in a certain direction, you simply use formula. That formula which has been used before will work again, if implemented in the same sequence as before; and there are sciences to do with this, which are not taught to the general population. You find that Bernays, and other people I'm sure, were taught them by various secretive societies where archives are kept, archives of histories, not only of one or two countries but pretty well of all the major countries and empires down through the ages. They use these techniques to their advantage, to help mould the future and the future which is being moulded today, especially this century, is called the age of transition. That's change, change is everywhere, that's the name of it, change and transition; and, I'm always a bit wary of anything with 'transition' in it, because, even the ones that seem to be opposing this often have their leaders supplied. Even some of the documentaries I've mentioned, you have to be very careful because you'll find the same champions of, supposedly, freedoms, on every different one. They're taken as the specialists, even in Britain; so be very-very careful about these documentaries; because you find when you oppose them head-on, you're simply working in the dialectic and you can't win using their technique, you're on their chessboard. I'll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt, we're Cutting Through The Matrix and discussing this incredible system we're living in. It truly is so interwoven and so well directed that it's difficult, it's like looking through a very tightly-woven cloth, trying to see through the other side, because all the big Foundations, thousands of non-governmental organisations, all funded by these Foundations, and various governmental agencies are all working in concert to bring in what they all know is an age of transition, or change as they call it. As they keep chanting 'change is good', remember what Lenin said: we shall win by slogans, this repetition of slogans. Those that prattle off slogans seldom know what they really mean, they don't reason them through, they just rattle them off and they're the sheep that George Orwell has in his Animal Farm that say "Four legs good, two legs bad"; and, once it changes to "Two legs good, four legs bad", they don't know the difference.

What is change? What's the change they're talking about? It's the change of an entire world society into, not only a new way of living, earning your keep you might say, but literally being born in order to serve a world state. Since all of these agencies, this combined mesh of power – that rules over people – have decided that everyone, pretty well, beneath them (of course) is mentally ill. In fact, anyone who won't go along, or disagrees with this agenda, or any single part of the agenda, is – to them, obviously –

mentally-ill and should be rectified. They have all these plans to do it, when they give themselves, which they're already doing, the right to come into the womb, literally, and insert various genes, you know, improved genes, into the foetus, so as you won't be a throwback to a primitive man. You might have some anti-social tendencies, if you were allowed to just be born the way you were conceived, you were initially started off; and, this is all agreed upon at the top, but they also agree that the world they're bringing in is a world where there will be no private property, it's based on the old Plato's idea of The Republic, this Utopia of theirs, where all the intellectual intelligentsia elite will, basically, be given great big palaces to live in, courtesy of the workers, who will keep it up to scratch and replenish it and repair it and so on. That way they won't have to technically own anything. That was the basis, remember, of the Soviet Union; and, as Orwell also said: "Some are more equal than others in such utopias". We know that the Politburo and their families lived an equivalent lifestyle to any high bureaucrat in the Western World, same kind of income, they had access to all the luxuries of the West. They also had the Dachas in the country where they'd go and relax, with servants attending them, just like nobility in Europe.

This is the system they're bringing in and they've already decided a long time ago they would not need so many people using up the world's resources, as they say, because the intelligentsia also decided, at meetings – and they had world meetings back in the 1800s about this. Go into the founding of the Fabian Society and you'll find out that they did literally mean that they were going to hammer the world into shape, on an anvil, the proper shape, the way it should be, according to them; and, they've been heavily at work ever since, doing so. Big-big money came into the Fabian Society, big money. The Astors came over to Britain and became Lord and Lady Astor and they funded it too and the money that they had in those days, many millions of dollars would make them billionaires, many of them, a few times over today. It's never explained why there was an interest of these very wealthy people who obviously didn't get their money by playing fair, no one does. They wanted to come over and – supposedly – help the working classes, but it had nothing to do with helping the working classes; it was, again, a scientific agenda: there was too much poverty; therefore you had to get rid of the poor. Meanwhile, the Fabian Society became the champion of Labour, or the Left Wing, which is just the same thing as Liberal in other countries. It's all deception, you have one hand basically, one body, using one hand on one side and it's using its other hand on the other. That's the dialectic that we get caught up in – and, most people never get out of – they pick sides and so many studies have been done on this, on how people pick sides, it's unbelievable.

I can remember reading years ago, when they talked about the coming information wars and how Internet, especially, would give access to so many people to start to disintegrate the planned society, the one that was already planned to go ahead, and how they'd combat that. They had studies done on how groups are formed, even in cyberspace, before they gave us cyberspace, because this work had already been Marshall McLuhan, Professor Marshall McLuhan, and others, into how we perceive things and McLuhan himself said that an age was coming, back in the '60s, an age would come, and it already was there, to one extent, through telephone itself, where you're talking to people across the world that you

never see, you are, in a sense, a voice with the body left behind in some kind of electronic space, just floating around talking to other voices and he predicted that this would become more and more real for people, as the unattached voices become more real than the people living next to them. Well, this is actually happening in our lifetime and, again, those big powerful organisations moved into this whole sphere because that was their territory: how to control the mind through altering perception.

I've said before: if you fight them, the way that you normally fight them, you're done for because they've already worked out, by, they call it Neuroscience, it's a neuroscience technique, of how groups are formed, how friendships are formed over the Internet in fact. And, from the very beginning, going back to that article I read years ago, on the coming information wars, where they said they'd insert Trojan Horses right into chat rooms and so on, who'd be trained to have maybe five different identities; and, none of the other people would know that one person had five identities, they'd think that this was all different people and this one would stir up, when a group started to get power, or at least get information shared amongst them, and a common agenda linked up, this person would then start to grumble and say 'so and so said this about you'. Then you'd email it back to this other person, not realising it was the same person, being five different names; and, they were trained to do this and they're all over the place, that's why I never go into forums. You can't, you can't do it.

Everything that happens in our lifetime is planned before we're given the vehicles for making it even happen. There's an article, it's from TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences Vol.9 No.1 January 2005. It's well worth looking into, by Martha J. Farah, Center for Cognitive Neuroscience, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA. It goes into the Introduction, if you scroll down the page, it says:

Almost three decades ago, in the picturesque coastal retreat of Asilomar, California, a group of molecular biologists gathered to discuss the safety of the newly developed recombinant DNA technology. In the years since, concern about the risks of genetic engineering have remained prominent in the public consciousness, as well as commanding the attention of academic bioethicists,

That's eugenicists basically.

government regulators, and biologists themselves. At the start of the 21st century, neuroscience has developed to a point where it, too, may have profound effects on society, extending far beyond the research laboratory or medical clinic. Like the field of genetics, neuroscience concerns the biological foundations of who we are, of our essence. The relation of self to brain is, if anything, more direct than that of self to genome. Perhaps more important, neural interventions are generally more easily accomplished than genetic interventions. Yet until recently there has been little awareness of the ethical issues arising from neuroscience.

Now, maybe a few weeks ago, I read an article from a Professor in Holland on the subject too, that's really way ahead in its workings and its use upon the people, where he was discussing how this could be used, this science can be used to literally manipulate everyone's mind, on any topic, very easily. Getting back to this article, it says:

Neuroethics encompasses a large and varied set of issues, and initial discussions focused on various different subsets of those issues.

It goes on to say here:

Neuroethics encompasses a large and varied set of issues ... Some neuroethical issues concern the practical implications of neurotechnology for individuals and society. Technological progress is making it possible to monitor and manipulate the human mind with ever more precision through a variety of neuroimaging methods and interventions. For the first time it may be possible to breach the privacy of the human mind, and judge people not only by their actions, but also by their thoughts and predilections.

Understand: on the Internet, and I've read articles about this from the Military themselves, where they have a duplicate of every one of us in a virtual world, with all our habits, traits etc and they get all the information from us, voluntarily, via the Internet. Back, after these messages, with more.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix, reading an article about Neuroscience; and; this science is so far ahead, it's astonishing how far ahead they have gone with the various technologies involved. Before, they used to have just simple observation of people and lots of tricks to observe them too and I've read books from the '50s on advertising, I've read them on the air some of them, on how they used to study people to see how they shop and to see if certain colours or the way things are packaged would make people buy certain things and impulse buy and so on. We've always been studied for this, but this is way beyond this, it's right down to trying to break down you as a personality, in order to control you, to manipulate you in such a way that you won't even know that the ideas or thoughts in your head are not your own. I've talked about articles before where they have technology of direct voice to skull, it's now used in advertising in New York at least, I don't know where else it's used, but that was in all the major newspapers. These are intrusive technologies, because who has the right to come right inside your skull and advise you to vote for someone or go and buy something in a store that's nearby? That's intrusive; and, don't forget that, don't ever believe for a minute that those in the Pentagon and those who control the minds of people and who are really interested in how to control people, like the CIA, don't

think that haven't gone way behind that. Of course they have. In fact, over the weekend, I was looking at an article, it was on Google videos in fact, from major TV companies back in the '60s and '70s, doing exposés on even the old MK-ULTRA that was going on at the time, that went beyond using psychiatric hospitals and LSD and shock treatment. They were hiring, the CIA was running prostitutes across the country, with TV cameras in the rooms and the whole idea was to get the 'Johns' on taking various drugs and then observing the effects on them. At least, that's what they told the public and we still don't have access to all the kinds of drugs they were testing on these characters or what happened to these people.

I've always said you don't have to worry about the guys 'over there', whoever they are, wherever they happen to be, you worry about the guys in your own country, at the top, in the big secret societies, the kind that's called MI6 and CIA and Mossad. These are the guys you worry about, because they use everyone as a guinea pig and it could be you, me or anyone else and thousands of us. Their idea being to control millions of us.

Getting back to this article here, on Neuroscience. It says here:

Neuroscience is providing us with increasingly comprehensive explanations of human behavior in purely material terms. Although the field of neuroethics is young and still evolving rapidly, the time seems ripe for a review in which the key issues of neuroethics, both practical and philosophical, are surveyed and placed in relation to one another.

Remember: the CIA will be funding a lot of these programmes in the universities, as they always have done before.

Brain imaging and brain privacy

Among the neuroscience technologies that present new ethical challenges of a practical nature is functional brain imaging. This includes the familiar false-color images of positron emission tomography (PET) and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), as well as the electroencephalography-derived methods of event-related potentials (ERPs) and magnetoencephalography (MEG) and optical imaging methods such as near infrared spectroscopy (NIRS). These methods vary in their invasiveness and portability, which constrain the uses to which they can be put, although any one of them can be used to obtain personal information surreptitiously, in a study ostensibly designed for a different purpose. In principle, and increasingly in practice, imaging can be used to infer people's psychological states and traits [1,3,7].

For example, in “neuromarketing” brain imaging is used to measure limbic system response to a product that may indicate consumers’ desire for it.

Do you know that in the supermarkets they have tiny little fish eye cameras along shelves? They’ve had them since the ’60s and they pick up the pupil, how it dilates or constricts when it sees a certain product and all that data’s fed back into banks. We’re all guinea pigs you see. It says here:

In one recent demonstration, brain activity related to soft drink preference was sensitive to both the taste of the drink and to the brand name

Then they go on about Coke and Pepsi.

...To the extent that neuroimaging can measure unconscious motivation to buy, it provides a valuable new kind of information for marketers. Another potential use for functional imaging of brain states is lie detection. Although fMRI-based lie detection is far from feasible in real-world situations,

Well, they’re actually working on that now, as you know. Remote lie detection outfits are starting to put them in the airports and everything.

researchers have found correlates of deception in the laboratory [9]. ERPs come closer to providing actual brain-based lie detection. They have been used to identify ‘guilty knowledge’ by distinguishing responses to items that are generally known to be associated with a crime and items that only the perpetrator would know are associated [10]. An example is shown in Figure 1.

Anyway, they call it Brain Fingerprinting but they also go into, of course, sex and everything else and pleasant stimuli. Where did they get all this information on pleasant stimuli, well, they got it from testing on prisoners and sexual perverts in prison, showing them all these photographs and wiring them up, that’s where they got all this data. I’ll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I’m Alan Watt, we’re Cutting Through The Matrix and I’m trying to, with the limited information that’s available to any of us, at the bottom here, piece things together; and, I was thinking over the weekend too about an article I read recently of how, in Japan, they’d tapped in, and I said this a long time ago, this would be able to be done, they’ve tapped in to the signals coming from a person’s eyes to the back of their brain, to the visual cortex, and, now they can actually see what the person’s seeing, at

least writing, they can actually write things down and see it on a computer. I'm sure that's been done, this has been done at the bottom, I'm sure it's been done at the top long ago. In fact, when Nick Begich first showed those devices on the Wendy Mesley show, in Canada, on television that the CIA had used in the 1950s, they could put thoughts in their head. Now, if they could put thoughts in your head, why couldn't they be able to read your thoughts as well, to an extent? If everything is electro-magnetic currents and so on, electro-chemical currents, giving off signals, I'm sure they're so far ahead in all of this area, from all of your senses, they pretty well decode them all and have an idea what's going on; and, I'm sure, that information is kept at the very-very hush secret systems way above even than the CIA, because their bosses would never give them the same kind of weaponry they have, you can believe that. Science has always at least, as far as I can see, held in three categories, for all of the sciences. That's the ones at the bottom that do research, the ones in the middle, like the CIA and some of the higher special forces that get higher technology to use; and, then the bosses above them and they have the stuff that's even way ahead of that.

We're given obsolete stuff at the bottom. All of this technology is well-funded, remember, scientists and the universities too, get grants to do research but they're told what to do it on; and, it's always of use to those in power, that's what everything is about, it's about power and control. Therefore, they fund particular programmes that they're really interested in and, naturally, this is a field they fund heavily, using our tax money, because, the future they have designed for us is to be a totally-surveyed society, surveilled society, a society where there is no privacy and a population that doesn't mind that. We have a generation growing up now who think it's quite natural to give out all your data to anyone who asks for it, even people on the Internet and websites and so on, they've got all their data there. They think privacy is of no value; they have no idea that wars were fought in the past to get some privacy. If you go back not so long ago, not so long ago, in the European countries, the king's men could smash your doors down at any time, haul you off the land, kick you off and there was no court in the land that would listen to your problems, it was just the king's law. He would steal anything from you he wished to do; they're back at that stage now, governments acting as the old kings do and the police can actually confiscate your property and share the loot amongst themselves because they copy the Soviet system and that's what that was based on.

Nothing really changes, except that the sciences they're using can fool us into the fact that we're into a nice cosy society and the sheep don't notice that the wolf has big fangs anymore, he's well camouflaged, he wears a suit and tie and looks rather nice, or he might talk about wild life programmes on the television for you, to show you he loves animals and nature, as he brainwashes you that you're just another animal. That's how the sciences are being used.

Whatever is published to the public is fascinating enough, to know what they're doing at the bottom level; but you always keep in mind that what they're rediscovering at the bottom has been done at the

top a long time ago and how far ahead they truly are and it's always, as I say, to do with power. Power is the name of the game and the continuity of power. The elite, down through the ages, have never voluntarily given up any power to anybody. This whole farce of democracy was their scam, to make us work along with it while they got to the stage we're at now where most folk don't really care much about democracy. In fact, it's become such a vague term, we don't know what it is anymore. It's pretty sad, because we're truly being used, not just like guinea pigs, they're beyond the guinea pig stage, we are the subjects now, not just the test subjects, they're using techniques on us and this is technotronic warfare the big boys like Brzezinski talked about in his book *Between Two Ages*.

Here's an article from cnn.com on the Technology page and it says here:

TEL AVIV, Israel (CNN) — Keep your shoes and belts on: Waiting in long airport security lines to pass through metal detectors may soon be a thing of the past.

You know, Israel has pretty well all the patents on all the security equipment. Most of the security equipment in Britain, and all through the big cities in England, are owned by Israeli companies. I was watching a series to do with the bombings in London, an amazing series that some guy put together, it's called 7/7 Ripple Effect. It's a seven-set series and this guy will take you painstakingly through all the inconsistencies of what the Government told the public and then he looks up the actual facts and matches them together. In that documentary, he goes into the companies who own all the cameras, the fact being, that in all the sites where the bombing practices were to take place, that happened to be the real bombings, which means that it was all set to be real bombings in the first place, the cameras just happened to be out of action that day but it was Israeli companies that owned them. Here we are again, Tel Aviv Israel talking about airport lines:

Security experts say focus is shifting from analyzing the content of carry-ons to analyzing the content of passengers' intentions and emotions. "We are seeing a needed paradigm shift when it comes to security," says Omer Laviv, CEO of ATHENA GS3, an Israeli-based security company. "This 'brain-fingerprinting,'

See, this is right into that neuroscience you see

or technology which checks for behavioral intent, is much more developed than we think." Nowhere is the need for cutting-edge security more acute than Israel, which faces constant security threats. For this reason, Israel has become a leader in developing security technology. Several Israeli-based technology companies are developing detection systems that pick up signs of emotional strain, a psychological red

flag that a passenger may intend to commit an act of terror. Speedier and less intrusive than metal detectors, these systems may eventually restore some efficiency to the airplane boarding process.

They'll sell you any shmuck you see, shmuck I should say, for a profit, because these things can stop someone that's anxious, most folk going for a flight are anxious and tranquilisers will overcome that; and, even if you're a real terrorist, the tranquilisers would overcome that too. They're also flashing up certain words in different languages on a screen, subliminally, to see how you react and they scan your brain as they watch. You don't even know what's happening because they put them into ads, these different ads they have on the sides in airports. That's all intrusive and it's also deceitful, completely deceptive. They even have stuff built into the chairs you sit on, to see how your body's reacting to stress and so on. It's pretty-pretty disgusting what's really going on, but this is neuroscience and they're using gadgets now that can basically pick up your senses from a good distance. It's at the stage now where the police in police cars will soon get equipped to see if you're driving under stress. That'll be the next thing. This is the kind of society that's been brought in, a totally surveilled society. We have children now who are watching nothing but 'reality' shows and they see all these youngsters they think about the same age as themselves, they're just like them with cameras and they all want to be on TV. Have you ever wondered why these little cameras for your computer are so cheap? They're the cheapest part of everything, or anything, because they want everyone to buy them and put them in all their rooms, so that their little world is on view to the whole world; and, people are falling for this, especially the young. It's amazing what's really happening and it's all by design.

There's never been a power elite in history had so much, I mean really, they're just laughing themselves all over with glee at getting society trained to open their lives up for them to watch and see. It's never happened in history before. They don't have to force them to do it, it's all done by Neuroscientific persuasion and propaganda and repetition; and, the need for youngsters to belong to their peer group – to belong, it's very, very important to young people – every tyrant in history knows that. Hitler had the Hitler Youth; they had their young Communists in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. They always use the youth, who want to belong to something that gives them meaning; and, that's why too, they had an attack on the family. The same organisations that are running the world today said that they'd have to destroy the family, and then they could go straight for the minds of the youth. Those who were older were contaminated with their thoughts, their modes of behaviour, their morality was obsolete and a hindrance to progress, because they knew what progress was, they had it all in mind where they wanted to progress to. They had to eradicate all that was; and, they've done a darn good job of it.

Now, school and education, under UNESCO has stepped in and they're using UNESCO's mental health programme to test every single child on the planet, to see if they're mentally healthy enough to come into this new society; and, if not, what needs to be rectified about them. Remember: Julian Huxley was the first CEO of UNESCO and he was the brother of Aldous Huxley, who was the grandson of Sir Thomas

Huxley and Sir Thomas Huxley was the best friend of Charles Darwin. Socialism and Behaviourism, all tie in together with the Fabian Society, it all works together, along the same path, The New Man.

One of the founders of the Fabian Society, George Bernard Shaw, was a guy with a strange history himself, because a lot of these characters are always brought up with a mother but no father. It's the mother that gives the indoctrination, because the mother belongs to certain societies, that's why they're given this indoctrination; but, George Bernard Shaw wrote Man and Superman, he was a founder of the Fabian Society. H.G. Wells, apparently, never saw his father, he was an alcoholic lower middle class character whose professional job was being an extra batter at cricket, so he toured playing cricket and getting paid for it, like a hired hand, something that Wells was ashamed of because he hated the working class, he was terrified of the working class in fact. These are the sort of characters that were picked, people with big chips on their shoulder, picked by the very-very wealthy, like the Astor family, to do all the leg work and all the typing work and all the speeches.

Then you had the Webbs as well, Beatrice and Sydney Webb, who laid out all the rules and the groundwork and did all the bureaucratic write-ups, very boring people and yet that's the system they created that we're living in today. That's what all bureaucracy is fashioned after, the methodology of Sydney and Beatrice Webb.

As I say: shortly there'll be nowhere to hide, the last refuge used to be your mind, inside your own mind and, short of walking about with a lead helmet on, that's rapidly disappearing. They won't be happy, they will not be happy, until they are into your brain; and, even then, once they're into your brain, because you can still make decisions, it's not good enough that you control your brain; they want to put a chip in there eventually, and control it for you. Then, they'll feel safe, because, any decision that you make, will be a decision that they've programmed into you; but, you can see where this all must go and what I'm talking about has been discussed in big-big powerful meetings.

The people at the top are very paranoid, terrified as well, that enough people can come out with the facts and shout quite loudly that the king has no clothes. All this farce about terrorism and so on, and the sky is falling and global warming and incoming comets or whatever it happens to be, is all bogus, to get us on the road to stampede and then they can lead us into this Brave New World, that's what it's all about, nothing less than that.

I was listening to Rumsfeld one day, when he was talking about a strange bunch of terms he was using, he says we know all about the knowns, then there are the unknowns that we know nothing about and we know that we know nothing about the unknowns. He went on and on and on and this comes from documents in the Pentagon, where their big intelligence teams are looking at every possible thing that gets churned out of computers on disasters. There's hundreds of them, it's like getting up in the morning

and saying what can go wrong today and you tie your shoelaces and you tie them together and you fall on your face. Anything that could possibly happen and go wrong is part of this scenario and they're trying to cover every possible base, it's incredible, it's madness, it's utter madness at that level.

I always think back to Mao Tse-tung who said he wasn't afraid of armies, he was afraid of someone with an original idea, someone that could spread that original idea, because, you see, that's how Communism spread, in the first place. That's how Socialism spread, from an idea, from an individual. Those in power grabbed a hold of that idea, because they could use that technique, to control the people.

Always be careful of the groups that you join, because even if you start off with the best of intentions, people will infiltrate and be very helpful to you. In fact, there was a book, it's a handbook for that which is being used today called You Can Trust The Communists. If you can get a hold of it, read it through because it gives you the very strategies that are in use today. Where someone will come in and be the greatest secretary to your little club that you've ever had, before you know it, she'll work to the top and the next meeting she'll be voted in as the head and then she's off in different directions. I'll be back with more, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix, doing a bit of a rant tonight over different topics but they're all connected, because the future doesn't just happen by itself, the present didn't come about by a bunch of separate incidents, just coalescing together, it was planned this way. In fact, the Fabian Society was named after the emperor who used certain delaying tactics, over long terms, to get his objective resolved.

I've just got time here to mention a few of the Fabian members of the Fabian Society, from their own website, past and present: Clement Attlee (UK Prime Minister 1945-51); Ed Balls (British MP); Tony Benn (the Benn family's been in this forever, radical left Labour MP); Annie Besant (remember, Theosophist, it says here Theosophist and social activist; Lord Besant was her father, mind you, he gave her a hand); Tony Blair (UK Prime Minister 1997-2007); David Blunkett (Home Secretary for the UK 2001-04); Gordon Brown (The present UK Prime Minister). There's a whole list of them, whole list of people, going down and down forever almost and that's not them all, that's just some of the better known ones. HG Wells and all these guys of course are in there too and Ramsey McDonald, who was the head of state, first Labour Prime Minister of the UK, high Freemason, high Socialist and picked an odd name Ramsey. You have to look back into history to find out who was the first Ramsey that gave Ramsey's rant, interesting stuff. It's all connected together; it's not happenstance at all.

What's always amazed me though is how people can become so incredibly stuck on the groups that they come into; and, they never change their mind. You see, when we grow up, and we're always growing up, until you die. You're just starting to get something and you kick the bucket, that's the sadness about living.


These guys never changed, it's as though they were stuck with their views at 18 and didn't learn anything from then on and they're very adamant in their activism and the way they see things. That's an odd thing to happen, because you're supposed to mature, you have milestones throughout your life, as you acquire more knowledge and more wisdom about yourself and society; but, these guys don't, they're stuck there, their lives long. It's always astonished me; and, these characters, especially in societies like the Fabian Society, are hard-line, very hard line in their views and opinions.

When Tony Blair backed the US for this war on terror, you can bet your bottom dollar that the whole thing was planned, between higher powers on both sides of the Atlantic, before 9/11 went off; and, we know that for a fact and you have to say well these are very radical groups. Here's Tony Blair with the Fabian Society aligned with a guy and a bunch of guys from the Skull and Bones Society and it starts coming together, because the Fabian Society, although it champions, supposedly, Labour, at least it was known for that, that was never its intent. It was to lead the world into a brand new scientifically-controlled society where intellectuals would take their rightful place. You can go back to the writings of Jefferson and he said the world would be run by the natural nobility. That's what he meant by that and Jefferson was a member of those very high societies too.

Well, that's it for tonight folks. Sorry I couldn't take callers, so please call in again. From Hamish and myself in Ontario Canada, it's good night and may your god, or your gods, go with you.

October 22, 2025 at 7:42 am

EDIT | MOVE | SPLIT | TRASH | SPAM | UNAPPROVE | REPLY **#919**



Alan
Keymaster
(127.0.0.1)

Dr. WHO Hyping Incredible-Inevitable:

Now, the last time I was on, I was talking about the CBC Canada, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. They used to call it 'Communist Broadcasting Corporation' because most of the employees were hard-line Communists and many of them actually came from Russia, but that's the government station and, it hasn't really changed, it's very much like the BBC, it takes its format from the BBC. Every Commonwealth country, and Britain itself in fact, always has its own particular government-owned television and radio stations; so the CBC is owned by the Government of Canada, it's a propaganda arm. However, they have done quite a lot on the coming plagues etc and they have, over the years, done

documentary specials; they have them in their archives, and someone has hunted up various links for me, to find the audio and the radio archives and also some of the video from the video archives of the CBC. There is a link for this I'll be putting up at the end of the show that will take you to all of these documentary specials, some of them I think going back to the '70s; some even before, giving you the previous terror scares we were given nation-wide, in fact world-wide on previous flu scares and how it was all hyped up.

There's also some interesting facts come out because we've all heard of the Spanish Flu and that's the one that has been not only rediscovered but recreated, to be a killer actually more potent than the first one. It was a misnomer to call it the Spanish Flu, in the documentaries, and I'll put this link up for you to look at, after the show, on my website. They go into the Spanish Flu, Spain was a neutral country in World War One, it was the only country therefore that wasn't afraid to publish the fact that there was a world-wide flu already on the go; but, it started inside the United States and was spread across the world, across Europe, by US troops being sent abroad. It's interesting, because, later on, when the Swine Flu, the so-called Swine Flu came out, it struck in a military base in the US as well; and, we all know, that once you go into the army, you get all these inoculations and so on, you don't know what you're getting, one after the other. There's lots of documentation; and, I've written about this myself, and I've quoted some authors such as the one that was written in Canada, called Deadly Allies, with de-classified information from the Canadian Government, to do with the troops being used, sometimes, for various bacterial and viral warfare projects. So, I wouldn't be surprised if the one from 1918 was actually man-made at all, personally I wouldn't be, because they are always so far ahead in the sciences, way above what professors are taught at universities, way above. Whatever we get from Professor down, is old stuff to those at the top. I'll put that link up to the CBC ones that are strung together, it makes it much easier for you, at the end of the show. Back in a moment, after these messages.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt, this is Cutting Through The Matrix and, when you're going through these CBC archives, as I say, you'll find lots of contradictions from experts telling you different things on the same subjects, as to even the efficacy of the inoculations for instance. At one point, this expert was asked if a particular flu shot, should this avian flu come across, would the flu shot help and she said "probably not", the reason being: it would take maybe two years to get an actual vaccine that would affect it. So, there's all this double-speak all through these documentaries from the CBC itself and it really makes you wonder, at that level, which is pretty low level, as I say there's a much higher level of science, there's a level of science where they can put viruses together piece by piece, to create specific types; that's much higher than these lower experts that will be dealing with the public in pandemics. The hype that we've had for years now, on the coming plagues, the coming plagues, the coming plagues, I've got books from the '80s, early '80s that were writing about the coming plagues, it was just a sure thing, in these circles.

We've got to remember too: that every specialist has to 'pump up' his particular speciality, to keep his job and make himself very important. It's no different if you go into Africa in the 1700s and you'd find different competing witch doctors, each one with their own particular cures and rituals and techniques and formulas for making the cures, or dances or whatever it happened to be. It's the same thing in today's academia: they're all competing with each other for status and power. We're in an age of crisis creation; the crisis creation agenda was on the go before 9/11 happened in 2001. They tried to get the national ID cards out in 1998 in Britain; they passed an omnibus crime bill, which is an anti-terrorism bill, in Canada about the same time. Crisis creation was already being pumped up, by different areas of expertise; and, also we had the big fake Y2K alarm that, from the very beginning sounded implausible. The media itself created the hype and people put big bucks into trying to ensure computers would keep going, well none of them fell behind, nothing happened; now, they knew this at the top, nothing would happen, but it was this expectation of crisis coming; and, plus: studying the public's reactions to coming crisis was all part of it.

There's a good set of videos out there, I'll give the link to this as well, that goes through the psychology of controlling masses of people, by a few who understand the sciences, and it's called the Age of Transitions and it's from Information Liberation it's called. I'll put the links up and you can find all the other ones for yourself; but, it's an excellent series to show you how big Foundations, big powerful people, organisations can set trends, using techniques they understand that will ripple across the world and affect every area of your life, right into your parliament, or congressional buildings, into the minds of politicians and they're then implemented into effect, by law. It shows you how the techniques are used, all the way from Freud – and before Freud even – onwards using Psychology and Behaviourism etc. They understand how the masses of people 'tick'.

It also goes into the big agenda, to do with this big push; and, you'll hear the phrases uttered by the famous people they give us in front of television, over the years, telling us that this big change, change is good, long before Obama came along. This was going to be the century of change, right into coupling us with computers, interfacing us with computers, Transhumanist agenda, longevity, even immortality for some etc. They give you the big meetings where they talked about this, including one I've talked about, at Loyola University, they talked about, they give you some of the pieces that were discussed at that particular meeting; and, they have that meeting every year. That was the meeting where they said that have the chip ready to go in the brains of people. They have powerful regional computers set up; all they have to do now is get the public to accept it, and they would do that through predictive programming, by using novels and fiction, primarily, movies and even cartoons, to make the youngsters think it'd be a great thing to have. It also goes into the real purpose, because they said they would create a new societal structure, that's the important key to all of this, because, behind it all, is the big eugenics organisations that set up the Foundations, that have funded all of these Movements and have put science at the pinnacle of evolution. Of course they will decide what evolution is going to be, through science; and, they have decided that they want to reorganise the whole of society. Get rid of the

defective genes, meaning the defective people too, those that carry them, and have a programmed society, like a pyramid, all the way down to the bottom. Obviously, in such a society, no one would be a useless eater; you'd all be programmed to do essential tasks, to serve those at the top. Remember what Charles Galton Darwin and others have said: the elite themselves will remain untouched, they must be wild, as wild as animals, to retain their survival mechanisms, because they will be steering the ship of planet earth. So, look into this, this particular link I'll give you at the end of the show, The Age of Transition, from Information Liberation; a really good series on this, with good factual documentation, from the big boys themselves.

Now, getting back to the coming plagues that are supposed to terrify us as well, we're terrified of everything these days aren't we? That's what they live on, the media is on a frenzy of terror and fear and they've got to keep this hype going all the time, because, otherwise, we'll go back to grazing in the pasture; and, once the herd starts grazing, we get kind of 'antsy' about getting moved, we don't like it so much. I said that back in 1998, I said: once they get the public stampeded, once change after another, with fear driving the whole thing, they can keep the herd going through massive changes and we won't have time to catch our breath and rationalise and think or reason. We'll just gradually accept them as being normal, as we rush into the next one; that's the technique that is being used scientifically on the people, by those that know how to do it and they are out there. They knew this back in Bernays' day, the guy who was a great mastermind for advertising; he was the one that got women smoking, got them drinking beer and so on. How to do it, he understood it all, he was writing books in the 1920s.

When we look at the big organisations, like the World Health Organisation, you tie this together with another branch of the United Nations, which is NATO, and NATO – and I've read this before, some parts of it at least – they have a document out that's supposed to be available to every member of every NATO country, via your post office, or your public library. Good luck if you find it, because the Man Alive team in Britain had to send to the government for a copy, which they showed and most of it was blacked out; but, this is where they say that any contaminated area through disease, pandemic and so on, or even radiation, is to be cordoned off. That's the only purpose the Military has, not to feed you or help you, to stop you from moving from that area. If any individual tries to leave they're to be shot on sight. If whole groups try to leave, they're to be bombed from the air with, I think, CS gas or something. This article I'm going to read now, ties in with that, because it's to do with the World Health Organisation. This one is from Ireland but it's the same the world over. We're all in it together, because we're all global you see. It's from the Wise Up Journal and that's the 2nd of the first 2009, by Gabriel O'Hara:-

Horror Emergency Laws Set To Kill

The majority of this article is made up from an absolutely horrifying section of the National Medical Bill. Horrors that you've not heard about in 70 years are actually written down and they are legal. Everything

in this article has a link to the official bill. The section in question of the Medical Bill springs from the World Health Organisation standards and recommendations. Most countries are likely to have the same bills because most follow the WHO's lead, however in some countries these emergency plans can not be seen even by homeland security so this Irish Medical Bill could be a window into what other Governments are also prepared to do.

It's true, they're not telling all the Americans what they're going to be faced with, but this is the same one that's running your country. It says:

These specific emergency measures can legally be carried out without the so called emergency every happening in your country, all that is required is a simple alert from the unelected people at the WHO. As we will see, these psychotic Government actions to a so called "imminent" emergency will actually do more damage than if the emergency hit. We'll come to the Medical Bill in a moment but first we'll look at this 2008 pamphlet from the Government that states a worldwide pandemic would be caused by "a new influenza strain" and they are pretty confident when they state "there will be more pandemics". It also lets us know who is in control of kicking off the alert and actions when it says, "You will be advised to begin these preparations if and when the World Health Organisation confirms that a pandemic is imminent." The Department of Health & Children's National Pandemic Influenza Plan

They've one for children too.

shows the WHO puts our global society currently at phase 3 of a phase 6 global pandemic,

That's where they have us all right now, for this ridiculous flu that's still over in the Far East. I'll be back with more about this, after this break.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I'm Alan Watt, this is Cutting Through The Matrix and I'm reading from the Wise Up Journal, the documentation on how they're going to handle these pandemics, but it all comes from the World Health Organisation at the United Nations. It says here they use:

six phases of pandemic alert as a system for informing the world of the seriousness of the threat." Phase 3: "Human infection(s) with a new subtype, [...] We are now in Phase 3

That was back in

(January 2007).” The power to alert/get nations implementing WHO actions is further consolidated in to the hands of one person, the current Director-General

Which is Margaret Chan.

and the pandemic plan says, “the designation of alert phases, including decisions on when to move from one phase to another, is made by the Director-General of the World Health Organization. The transition between phases may be rapid and some phases may be skipped.”

Now, it’s interesting, this is to do with the flu, they’re just absolutely certain it’s going to mutate into something similar to, or maybe identical to the so-called, again, misnamed Spanish Flu, from 1918. Now that they know which three genes to put in it, I read that the last time I was on, they can put the right three genes and make it a killer virus you see; and they’ve been very successful at that. So, no doubt, they’re going to release this down the road, after they’ve weaponised it even more, to make it more lethal I’m sure and they’re getting everyone ready for this. It’s to be managed by the World Health Organisation. It says:

National Pandemic Influenza Plan also lists the following:

“A number of legal issues may arise from the public health management of pandemic influenza.”

“The World Health Organization has identified and categorised non-pharmaceutical public health interventions as follows:”

“Measures to increase social distance” “Measures for people entering or exiting an infected area within a country”

They’re going to lock you down within the country.

“Section 31 [Health Act] gives power to the Minister to make regulations to prevent the spread of an infectious disease and to treat people suffering from infectious disease. The regulations envisaged by the Act include:”

“Requirement for adults and children to stay in their homes”

Well, that ties in with the NATO one, that’s what you’re told to do. You don’t move, if you do, you’re shot.

“Requirement for adults and children to submit to examination, vaccination, immunisation” It then lists “suspension of travel”, “suspension of other gatherings”, and finally lists “possible security issues” as a wide scope power given to them. Lets look at Part IV of the Health Act which deals with infectious diseases and see how Governments will treat us when the WHO gives the ok. Let’s look at how the law will make all our rights evaporate

Well, what we’ve got left, I don’t think we’ve much left anyway, when we need them the most. Then, there’s a link here to one of the statute books <http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/1947/en/act/pub/0028/>

Section 38 contains a purposeful loophole to detain anyone. It legalizes the detention of, by force if necessary, people who are not identified as infected but are a “probable” source.

You’re probably not infected, but you’re a probable source. Meaning you came from that area, you’ve been through that area.

The name of section 38 is “Detention and isolation of person who is probable source of infection” and it states the following, “force may, if necessary, be used for the purpose of carrying out any provision of this subsection.”

You would be detained by force.

Part 2 of section 38 redefines the word person into patient:

This is very clever; see you have different rights as a person than you do as a patient. Under this section, they can now call you a ‘patient’

“(2) Where an order is made under this section in relation to a person (in this subsection referred to as the patient), the following provisions shall have effect [...]”. This makes it legal for the government imprison [to] people known not to be infected and label them as patients. Part K of section 38 tries to pretend that a person or a parent of a detained child can make an appeal to be released but it’s entirely up the decision of the minister and this “nice” sounding part actually allows the legal interpretation for people to be detained for what ever amount of time the state demands. The key word of part K is “determination” which has a couple of definitions in the dictionary one being “settlement of a dispute”.

It could take them years to settle a dispute, if they want to.

Part K states, “if no determination of an appeal under paragraph (h) of this subsection is made by the Minister and communicated to the person in charge of such hospital or other place within twenty-one clear days from the receipt by the Minister of such appeal, such person shall release the, patient”. If a determination/decision is made by the Minister for the status quo then the men, women and children detained will not be released. It also makes it legal for Government officers to detain people even if the Minister has not made any decision because it says if the government officer (“the person in charge of such hospital or other place”) is not told (“communicated to”) that the Minister has not made a decision (or even that there is an appeal) the officer does not have to release the person.

This is a bureaucratic nightmare, so you know what’s going to happen, no one is going to get released, that’s obvious, from even reading this part here. Imagine reading all this when the thing was actually going on. There’d be all hype and neurosis everywhere.

The Health act gives the power of relocating people (persons) to government facilities /camps /accommodation: Health Act section 40, “A health authority may provide accommodation for persons who are compelled to leave their homes on account of any steps taken under this Act or the regulations made thereunder for the prevention of the spread of infectious disease.” It gives the government the right to detain people in government facilities not just hospitals with the following line, [“the order to allow for the patient’s isolation in a hospital or other place convenient”].

I’ll read the rest of this, after these messages.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and I’m reading from an article from the Wise Up Journal, which deals mainly with Ireland’s set up agenda for dealing with pandemics but it’s from the World Health Organisation, which means that it’s the same in every other country. However, in some countries, like the United States, they’re not telling the public what the plans are. I know for a fact, from talking to different people in hospitals in the US, who work there, who have been recruited by the way by Homeland Security, they work now for Homeland Security, and they’re supposed to go around injecting people forcibly, with the military, if it breaks out in areas down there in the cities and so on. Let’s continue with this article here, it says:

Health Act section 32 A and B below deals with the entire population not just the infected and uninfected population incarcerated in hospitals and “other places”.

You see, ‘other places’ are camps.

It gives the Minister power to order the injection of the entire population (quote: “all adult persons” and “all children”) with a vaccine they believe might immunise against a pandemic “caused by a new influenza strain”. You are probably thinking how could they create a vaccine so fast, doesn’t it take years to prove it is safe? They are prepared to alter the entire population’s immune system and DNA with what would be officially an untested experimental vaccine, are you prepared for that? It’s the law now.

That’s true, when the SARS that came, there was more hype in Toronto when it happened and what really interested me was I wondered how much of this was a big test and propaganda exercise, because, for the first time, we saw the experts come out in their white coats and tell us all these horrific things and scary stuff. Meanwhile, they had not closed down, or stopped, the aircraft coming in from the countries that – supposedly – it was coming from. A few people were killed, much lower than people who would die in the regular annual flu. It was a lot of hype and so on, but I’m sure a lot of experimentation was going on and the studying of the public and getting us used to it coming, big time. Surely, they should have stopped them coming in, all passengers coming in from those areas. Once again, the Government used all the money to buy all these machines and gizmos to detect, by a person’s body heat, as they walked off the planes if they might be carrying infection, which is utter-utter tripe and nonsense because every infection has a prodromal period where, as it’s working in your body, it doesn’t show any symptoms as yet. It doesn’t show any raise in temperature either, so these machines are useless, but the government’s bought them anyway. To continue with this article though, it says:

Health Act section 32:

“(a) The Minister may by order declare that- (i) it is necessary, for the purpose of preventing the spread of a particular infectious disease, that all adult persons should submit themselves to a specified measure in relation to their protection or immunisation against such infectious disease”

“(b) The Minister may by order declare that—”

“it is necessary, for the purpose of preventing the spread of a particular infectious disease, that all children should be submitted to a specified measure in relation to their protection or immunisation against that infectious disease”.

I love how bureaucrats write their stuff, it’s no wonder there’s a chaos when you actually need to know what to do. It says:

Going back to the little public pamphlet that looks like it was designed for children it mentions 8 possible emergencies. All the other emergencies beside a pandemic are played down; even a nuclear incident at

Sellafield is nothing to worry about according to the pamphlet as it says "any radioactivity from an incident would be diluted before reaching Ireland." For other emergencies they use words of possibilities like, "in the event of such an incident", "you may be asked", but with the pandemic which is allocated more pages they have definite statements such as, "there will be more pandemics", "if and when", "every household in the country will receive a leaflet before the pandemic reaches Ireland [their area] ", follow "advice from the telephone hotline that will be set up or from official Government announcements to the media."

In other words: they're all waiting for it coming and we're supposed to sit and wait for their instructions to get us all hyped up and terrified. It says:

Months after this pamphlet was released the Irish government preformed for the first ever time test announcements over all media as the Irish Times reported in Dec 2008: "the State's radio and television airwaves fell silent for the first time early this morning as part of a Government exercise on giving urgent messages to the nation."

It's astounding, as I say, how they're getting everyone hyped up, in this age of crisis creation, for something that they're just absolutely going to happen. Now that they've recreated the killer flu, they've recreated it and I gave the documentation on that last week, now that they'd done that, it fits in just nicely with what they see coming. Now, remember: behind all of these big movements, the big changes that have to come for this century, this is a century of change, they keep telling us, it's a century where they will fix all the wrongs in nature, meaning man himself, meaning if you've anything at all in you, such as the potential to pass on to a child asthma, through your genes, or something like that, then possibly you won't simply breed, because they don't want that gene passing on into the next bunch that's coming up. It's the time for depopulation, where only the fit survive, the fit come through; and, the intellectuals come through. They've decided they don't need all the manual labour anymore, because science and robotics and cybernetics is going to save them all at the top. You see this all ties together rather well. One great way to bring down the population, obviously, is through pandemics, because pandemics won't simply hit you and then be died down and be gone, they'll crop up, every couple of years, maybe for ten, maybe for twenty years. By that time, the population will be vastly reduced. Now, I'm certain there'll be absolutely real vaccinations against these diseases, in fact, if you go into the bacterial warfare agreements at the United Nations, it states in there that during every process of the alteration of virus or bacterium, to upgrade it to the next stage, they must have an antidote that works for every single stage. They must have a real vaccine, but the public are not supposed to know that. We have to be given the stuff at the bottom, that we're told comes from chickens but maybe some human foetus tissue or blood or albumen thrown in as well; this concoction at the bottom. Now, we don't even have the ability to test that, who has the facilities to test that? The doctors themselves don't have the

facilities to check that; everything in that vaccine is taken on blind pure faith. That's the kind of society we're living in, it's incredible, absolutely incredible what's happening.

These boys mean business, there's a massive organisation, interconnected with a thousand parts to it, a thousand points of light, well-financed, well-funded, who have already drawn up the future, they've drawn up the future that will exist, after we've all gone. They've already drawn up the future, right down to the time period, I'm sure, when we'll all start to go, even faster than we are already and we're going pretty fast now. It's just amazing what's truly going on.

People who are travelling across the world, tell me all the time about the Chemtrails all over the major cities, from here, all across Europe, the major cities, that's where most of the spraying's going on, right across Europe, right across into the Middle East. I'm getting reports on this all the time from fliers and they do report, some of them, there's an amazing lethargy and apathy in the people below in the cities when they land and meet them. These Chems, these Chemtrails, that include all the different metallic particles, I'm sure, have other chemicals in them, which are basically dumbing-down and drugging the general public. No one, whether it's the CBC, or the BBC, or any other of these big government agencies for propaganda will ever mention the Chemtrails. Even though, on the news scenes, they'll show you the Parliament in Canada with Chemtrails above it, they won't mention the 'trails. It's astounding; and what we're doing here is giving you the facts on those things we do know about. Do you realise how much we have no idea about of the higher sciences that are in use right now?

Well, I'll go to the callers now and we've got Amber from British Columbia. Are you there Amber?

Amber: Yes, hello

Alan: Hello, how you doin'?

Amber: Good, how are you?

Alan: I'm hangin' in here and digging away in the snow.

Amber: Yeah, me too. Just before my question: I want to just mention something about Star Trek. I've been watching the original, I don't have cable but every once in a while, I'll just download something and watch it and I heard you talk about it and I always got a kick out of the original ones so I thought I'd watch them again, to see what you were talking about. But, I noticed that every time there's food, every time they eat or there's food, it's always just vegetables and fruit!

Alan: That's right, except for the Klingons, the Klingons like some sort of protein manufactured things, they're like worms, they moved, because they were clinging on to the past, the old warrior types. That's what that meant, the Klingons.

Amber: Oh really?

Alan: But everyone else, you're right, they're all vegetarians.

Amber: It's bright green and very blue and stuff, could that be the genetically-modified stuff?

Alan: Well, I've no doubt, totally synthetic as well, on the Enterprise. It's interesting that that whole series was predictive programming though; because, as I say, they gave you a setting to do with the world but they put the setting in space, because it was about multiculturalism, all the different aliens they'd meet and all of the worlds, which were just countries, would come in under this big UN agenda. That's really what it was showing you: it was the future and the types that all joined for international / interstellar space free trade that were the good guys, but anyone who said 'no we don't want to join you' were always portrayed as bad and evil and primitive.

Amber: Right, the united federation of planets.

Alan: That's right. In one of the shows too, they also showed you a planet where no one died, they'd conquered the death; and, so the whole idea was to get Kirk in there so as he could infect one of them, who were so bored at living forever, with a disease. They showed you all these people crowding outside the Star Trek, just millions of faces pressing in with overpopulation. You were getting all these messages from fiction, that now affect us today because that's what the programming was for, our own age group growing up to where we are today.

Amber: Pretty much every episode I watch, I'm like I totally know what you're talking about, with the predictive programming because I can relate it to what's really happening.

Alan: It is and the Red Berry you know, Gene Roddenberry, he was a member of NASA, and, of course, he was getting the stuff from NASA, who helped plan the scientific future they're going to bring in and he was told to go home and write stories around them and that's how they could put that into his episodes.

Amber: Really? So, it wasn't just completely his imagination?

Alan: No, never, these guys have no better imaginations than anyone else. They're always given – same with the sci-fi writers, they all belong to the Futurist Association and the big Foundations, they will fund you to write stories around particular topics and make them sound interesting; but, they'll tell you the main details to write around.

Amber: So, they'll have meetings and stuff and then they'll just draw their material from that?

Alan: Yes.

Amber: Wow, unbelievable. Well, my question actually was about recycling; I thought I heard one of your callers, in passing, say something about it being a scam. Is that really a scam too or should we be recycling all our stuff?

Alan: It is a scam generally, it's a scam. Part of it, again, was meant for propaganda purposes, to scare us into a world of lesser resources, that was part of it. The other part too, apart from the financial scam; I mean, here they have trained a world's population fairly well, to collect cans and bottles and all the rest of it, package them in separate boxes and, through their tax money, as well, apart from paying for it to be taken to the garbage and then through your tax money, you fund up the companies that will use the stuff and recycle it, so as they can make stuff, for free, and sell it all back to you. I mean, it's a pretty good deal if you're one of these companies. There's a lot of hand-shaking goes on and nudge-nudge wink-winks with the old masons and so on, getting all this stuff for free and training and getting the public to pay for the transportation of all this stuff to them. I mean, that's a brilliant business to be in.

Amber: Right, it makes you think.

Alan: Then you have the professor in Japan and I read his article who said it was all nonsense and he went through the reasons why it was all nonsense.

Amber: Really? What was his name?

Alan: Well, it's on my website, from about a month ago, if you go back, you'll find an article I read from and he put it down very-very well, explained his argument very-very well indeed as to why it was a complete scam.

Amber: Ok, I'll find it. Thank you so much.

Alan: Thank you for calling.

Amber: bye.

Alan: Bye now.

Here's another thing too, see we live in cons, there's always a big con going on about everything, that we simply take for granted, because most folk don't reason through any information, they just hear it; and, if it's said over and over and over again, they're inclined to believe it. If they're all believing this at the same time, gradually believing it at the same time, it comes into their general conversation and they don't know from where it comes and they're adopting all this stuff, it's pure propaganda; but, those who put out this scientific indoctrination understand the masses and I've got to admit it works incredibly well. The marketing companies understand the mass behaviour of humans, male and female, in all age groups too; and, that's what they use to programme us via the media. Remember what I said last week: there's no law anywhere that says the news media, any news media, has to tell the public the truth on anything. Isn't that a revelation? There is no law, because they're private companies, in business, they're there for business and no law has been written to say they must tell you the truth. There are laws written that say in times of crisis they will tell the public what they're told to tell the public, by the security organisations of that country; but, there's no law to say that they must ever tell you the truth.

Here's an article from Belfast here, Belfast Telegraph, it says:

Environment minister Sammy Wilson: I still think man-made climate change is a con. Spending billions on trying to reduce carbon emissions is one giant con that is depriving third world countries of vital funds to tackle famine, HIV and other diseases, Sammy Wilson said.

There's a break coming, so I'll finish this after I come back again.

=== BREAK ===

Hi folks, I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix, reading an article from the Belfast Telegraph and it's about a member of parliament who's come out and he's said a few times in fact climate change is a con. Wednesday, 31 December 2008. He says:

Spending billions on trying to reduce carbon emissions is one giant con that is depriving third world countries of vital funds to tackle famine, HIV and other diseases, Sammy Wilson said... [He] has been

heavily criticised by environmentalists for claiming that ongoing climatic shifts are down to nature and not mankind. But while acknowledging his views on global warming may not be popular, the East Antrim MP said he was not prepared to be bullied by eco fundamentalists.

Good term, because that's what they are. It's amazing how many people who are out there just waiting for a god to come along that they can follow, like Mr. Rockefeller or whoever else is at the top there. They're just waiting for someone to follow, because there's some angst in them and they want something to take it out on, you see; and, there's no end to these fanatical fundamentalists. He says:

"I'll not be stopped saying what I believe needs to be said about climate change," he said. "Most of the people who shout about climate change have not read one article about it. "I think in 20 years' time we will look back at this whole climate change debate and ask ourselves how on earth were we ever conned into spending the billions of pounds which are going into this without any kind of rigorous examination of the background, the science, the implications of it all. Because there is now a degree of hysteria about it,

He's absolutely right that they've drummed up hysteria about it, on purpose mind you.

fairly unformed hysteria I've got to say as well.

He knows it's organised and it's directed.

"I mean I get it in the Assembly all the time and most of the people who shout about climate change have not read one article about climate change, not read one book about climate change, if you asked them to explain how they believe there's a connection between CO2 emission and the effects which they claim there's going to be, if you ask them to explain the thought process or the modelling that is required and the assumptions behind that and how tenuous all the connections are, they wouldn't have a clue.

It's true; they haven't a clue, if you ask and really go into it with them. They've nothing to fight back with except anger and hate, because they're on the fringe, that's why they recruit the nutcases on the fringe, to go into all of these big Movements. They've done it before with other big Movements; it works very well. He says:

"They simply get letters about it from all these lobby groups,

It's true they send them out to all the fanatics you see.

it's popular and therefore they go along with the flow — and that would be ok if there were no implications for it, but the implications are immense." He said while people in the western world were facing spiralling fuel bills as a result of efforts to cut CO2, the implications in poorer countries were graver.

Well, they want to kill off the public in the poorer countries as well remember.

"What are the problems that face us either locally and internationally. Are those not the things we should be concentrating on?" he asked. "HIV, lack of clean water, which kills millions of people in third world countries, lack of education. "A fraction of the money we are currently spending on climate change could actually eradicate those three problems alone, a fraction of it. "I think as a society we sometimes need to get some of these things in perspective and when I listen to some of the rubbish that is spoken by some of my colleagues in the Assembly it amuses me at times and other times it angers me."

It's true, there's nothing worse than hearing somebody guff off about their religion, some real fanatic; and, that's what this all is you see, for the brainwashed fanatics. That's what we hear.

Oh, the music's coming in. That's the end of the show for tonight, so, from Hamish and myself, it's goodnight and may your god, or your gods, go with you.

October 22, 2025 at 7:43 am

[EDIT](#) | [MOVE](#) | [SPLIT](#) | [TRASH](#) | [SPAM](#) | [UNAPPROVE](#) | [REPLY](#) [#920](#)



[Alan](#)
Keymaster
(127.0.0.1)

The Neo-Eugenics War On Humanity

by Alan Watt

I'm Alan Watt and I'm an author and researcher into geopolitics really, and history. I follow where the world has been, the techniques that were used to bring us to those stages and I apply them to where we are today, and how the future is planned.

I've researched so many books; I've got a library of my own. I like paperback books or at least hardback books because they're permanent records of the past, and if you can't understand the past you won't understand the present or the future.

I've also been in the music business, heavily involved for years. And I saw how culture creation worked from the top, and how generations were swayed into new fashions, new ideas.

I've been following the histories of what's now called "the new world order" for many many years, and I try to go into the books written by the big players; the technocrats themselves – those famous people, like the Kissingers, the Brzezinskis and so on, the Huxleys, the Lord Bertrand Russells, who all worked for the same organizations. And I came to the conclusion really that there was only one big organization with many sub-categories. These boys tend to publish the world that they saw coming into view and they wrote it in their own hand basically. They told us where they were taking the world.

And when you start studying these things about the age of 14-15, or even younger, and reading their books – and you live long enough – you will see that the world has turned out exactly as they planned. This can't be coincidence. And who can really write up a wish list and make it happen, globally, unless there is an organization? Very very powerful, probably the only organization really on the planet. An organization that can fund all sides, all oppositions, and using this synthesis of conflicting parties, they can literally make the world come into view as they planned.

They plan in centuries. And the astonishing thing is when you go into the United Nations, which was loosely based on the Soviet system, they plan certain parts of their agenda in 50 year plans, some in 100 year plans, and some even in 150 year plans for different aspects of it. The Russells, the Huxleys, Brzezinskis and so on, also use the same terminology with their long-term plans.

And you've got to understand too that nothing in culture comes out from the grass roots. Even Plato talked about that thousands of years ago. He said that if it was a grass roots movement really coming from the people, then those in charge – the dominant minority – would lose control. Therefore every change in culture, right down to fashion and music – and this was written 2,300 years ago – had to be authorized from the top, and promoted from the top, if it fitted with the continuance of control over the public.

And these are sciences which were taught down through the ages (they're still taught today, to the big players) and they've used it to the full in the 20th century, now into the 21st century with the use of television, mass communications, radio etc. Everything has been given to us for the appropriate time and stage in the actual planning.

For those who are coming into this kind of study, it's best to go into the books written by the big players themselves. They love to boast. [Henry] Kissinger's got lots of books out there, so has [Zbigniew] Brzezinski. These are probably two of the master players in geopolitics. Try to stay away from all the

conspiracy books that are also put out there on purpose – very fascinating books, but they lead you in circles forever without giving you the overall picture to the fact that every generation has a purpose, up until this present time.

And in a post-industrial era these “big boys” have decided, and their masters too, that we are simply superfluous and they no longer need us. Hence we have big foundations coming forward and organizations like the Optimum Population Trust, who have decided to come out openly and demand that governments start radically reducing the populations. We are now the “useless eaters”, as Lord Bertrand Russell called us.

Our ideas, our opinions on everything, our world view, even to do with population – and the fake view that we’re over-populated – is all projected to us by the mainstream media, working in concert for their masters. And we begin to parrot what we hear through repetition – and that’s so important; it’s repetition with slogans and catchphrases. And once you hear it happening in your own local group, your milieu, then you know it’s working.

And the camera can make anything appear to be true. You’ll see that in India for instance, they always use the same streets of Bombay, to make you think that you’re massively overcrowded, and that’s the impression people think of the entire Indian continent. The Indian continent is huge with thousands and thousands of miles of forest, where no-one lives. It’s the same in Africa too.

China, being the model state for the world for instance, put into effect the United Nations policy to the extreme, with its population reduction and the movement of people off of the rural areas into cities. They started that years ago. Right now they’re in the process of moving two hundred million more people off into the major cities, and that’s in the major newspapers.

The cities appear to be crowded because everyone’s being moved into them. In the Western world since the 1950s again under the term of “urban sprawl” and stopping urban sprawl, the Western countries also signed agreements to do no more building in the outskirts of the major cities. All existing buildings have to be used or else knocked down and replaced with even higher ones, but regardless with the immigration and the free flow of people now from third world countries, the Western countries appear to be overcrowded.

And yet the UN’s own statistics show, and so do the national censuses show, that the Europeans for instance, and Canadians and Americans – who have been here for a couple of hundred years – are actually in decline. So the over-population problem is simply an image projected by the media, as more and more people are crammed into the same cities and they bring more immigrants in to fill them.

I also realized the system of schooling, when I was going to school, was bogus. The histories were bogus and I was very very lucky to have access to very old libraries, very old town libraries. Some of them had reference books going back into the 1700s, written at the time. When you compared the histories I was being taught in school to the histories that were written at the time, they were completely different. You had a deeper understanding of how geopolitics had been used in the past to even populate the country of Canada. London couldn't get immigrants to go off into the new colonies.

What they did for Australia was to create so many laws that you couldn't help but break them – and poverty. And therefore stealing a loaf of bread to feed you or your family would get you deported to Australia, with your family. That's how they populated Australia; crime. They created the laws for crime. With Scotland we had a rebellion, which could have been rigged – and I often think it was – and the whole of Scotland was punished. And they deported millions of the Scots off to the Americas, to populate the Americas. This is geopolitics in action. That's how it works. And whole peoples are often moved from their land because the elite masters want them elsewhere to be productive, for them themselves, the masters.

When you look at the strategy for the US and Canada – again long-term strategy, long-term planning – you'll find that the big corporations of their day, the Hudson's Bay companies, the Fraser companies, were given charters to own the land before Canada was Canada or the US was the US; they were simply called the Americas. These were private international corporations that had the power of life and death over everyone who lived within their areas. The queen or the king had a consulate in every country, lieutenant general or governor general they call them. They still have one in Canada today, who represents the queen. They have all the powers over life and death of subjects under that governor.

How they stopped rebellion in the past was to give us an idea of what they called democracy. They knew from the Chartist movement in Britain for instance, and elsewhere in other countries, people were demanding rights for the first time. And so once again they gave us champions to speak on our behalf which calmed the people down, thinking for the first time in history the people were involved in their own destiny creation. And nothing was further from the truth. Because the planners knew that once you bring people into a country or continent, create real wealth for them and get businesses going, clear the land, drain the swamps and so on, they can take it all away from you through laws 200 years down the road. And that's what's happening now; long-term geopolitics once more.

And if you think I'm kidding about this go into the history books written at the time – they're still there in some of the libraries. And you can also go into the art of geopolitics. There are even videos on youtube of Brzezinski boasting about how he set up the Taliban in Afghanistan. You'll see him encourage them to fight the Soviets at that time in the 1970s, and he actually says "yours is a holy war." This man, who obviously believes in nothing but himself and his own peer group, is encouraging another people to go

and fight a holy war, a jihad – and he uses these terms – against the Soviets, knowing full well once it was set up and it was backed by the CIA, that 10–15 years down the road, they'd be a problem. And then they'd have to go to war with the very group they'd created to fight the Soviets. That's what's happening today; long-term strategies. Well that's how history has always been run.

If you can go into the books where you find the British Home Office is mentioned, study the history of the Diplomatic Corps, because their diplomats were spies. They would go into territories, set up embassies and collect intelligence data for future invasions. Their job was also to try and grab the rights of minerals, gold, silver, etc. across the planet, all natural resources, and find ways, long-term strategy, to either bribe it off the present rulers of those countries or else create an ultimate war with them and simply steal it, under the guise of occupation.

We're living through a stage today where this is all coming to a culmination. This is the post-industrial era. We're post-technical almost in the West; it's all done in other countries, all the technical stuff. And Brzezinski himself talks about the technocratic era, where the future will be for an elite with a highly trained bureaucracy underneath them and scientific elite, who will not need the human labour that was needed in the past.

Human labour that is excessive, and is unemployed, and is hungry, is now a threat to that established elite. So now they're doing something which they can only do to the human species. They don't need to do this with animals; with animals they just go out and hunt them and kill them. We're the only species that has to be convinced to allow ourselves, for the good of all, to be sterilized and bring down the population, through abortion on one end, and euthanasia on the other, under the guise to save the planet. And unfortunately with the massive propaganda campaigns that are all over media, in every country at the same time, with all the big foundations backing them with unlimited financing – remember too, the foundations are owned by the international bankers themselves – then they can pull all of this off. And unfortunately it really is working.

In kindergarten now, you walk into a kindergarten anywhere in Europe or Americas, and you'll see the rainbow inside every single one of them. You'll see all of the terms about the world – here's the globe, 'we're all global' – and you'll see the greening messages everywhere, everywhere, and how sacrifice will have to be made to save the world and the planet and future generations of society. Sacrifice.

You tie that together with the institutions that were comprised of the Fabian society, which was a member of the Royal Institute of International Affairs – that's one society. The Council on Foreign Relations is also the same thing as the Royal Institute of International Affairs. They are what Thatcher and Professor Carroll Quigley called "the parallel government". They have told us what the future is going to be. Some of their members have even written books about the need to cull off massive amounts of the population

by any means possible. And so we see this final stage being pushed as they convince us that we are the problem.

The Club of Rome also belongs to the same group. In the 1990s the two founders said that back in the 1970s at the Club of Rome, they were given the task as the premier think-tank for the globe, for this global society, the task to find ways of reducing the population and controlling the people to go along with this, convincing the public how to go along with it. And they said they'd looked at all possible means of doing so, what had worked before? – Again, geopolitics, strategy. Under warfare conditions the public will give up freedom.

The public will be directed by governments, bureaucracies and police, military, etc. Under warfare the public sacrifice, they'll have less food, they'll ration stuff; they go along with it to save themselves. Therefore, they'd have to find a warfare strategy – a reason for war. And what they came up with was that man was the enemy of the planet. They said the idea that global warming could be created and blamed upon mankind would fit the bill. These are the words they used; "that would fit the bill". Written in the 1970s and decided at the think-tanks then, and published [in 1991] by the guys involved in a book called *The First Global Revolution*, well worth reading.

When they hit upon an idea from a premier think-tank, they will never change that agenda. I've said before it wouldn't matter if we were up to our eyes in snow all year round, they will still stick to global warming – that's the agenda. Now of course they've changed it slightly to "climate change", which simply means changes in the weather. And they're in the process now of convincing the general public to be afraid of summer, for instance. It's all done through the alteration and distortion of perceptions. Massive psychology is used on all of this, and they certainly understand mass psychology of the general public.

These boys don't simply announce things or make up a wish list of the future and send it up the chimney to Santa Claus. When they come up with an idea, they implement it. I've followed the United Nations Department of Statistics as they announce every single year the sperm count of the Western male, which has been falling drastically since the 1950s. They say that it's down by about 75-85%. Now when something like that's happened across the whole of Europe and the Americas in 50 years and they suddenly started noticing it, sudden onset, and there's no crisis made about it, there's no comeback after announcing the statistics, they just tell you the cold hard statistics and go off to the next statistic on some other topic – that means it's part of the agenda, otherwise it would be a crisis. If this wasn't planned and part of the agenda, believe you me it would be a crisis if they didn't authorize it.

And now they tell us that the average American has less than 20% sperm and only about 15% is motile. That's not a coincidence. What happened in the 1950s to start this ball rolling? In the 1950s they suddenly

put all the known female synthetic estrogens into the food supply. They put it in baby food. Procter & Gamble were the first ones to admit after investigation, 40 years later, that they were using a rinse to supposedly sterilize the baby bottles, and it contained Bisphenol A – an odd thing to rinse baby bottles with, when Bisphenol A is the very thing that attacks young male children at that age, and stops the testes from developing properly.

You go back even further into more detail and you find out that the cosmetic industry was using insufflatants. Insufflation is a technique where certain carriers are put into the creams themselves, and these creams then absorb into the skin carrying other chemicals with them. They're almost like the payloads – they carry the payloads into the target in the bloodstream. We find that the women were highly toxic with the artificial Bisphenol A and other ingredients, and therefore within the first 8-12 weeks of pregnancy with a male child there was a very good chance that male would grow up to be either almost completely sterile or as I say maybe have some motile sperm.

This was all understood 50 years ago. Bisphenol A for instance, was discovered in the 1890s. And the properties it had against humans, especially males, was known then too. Now it's in all the beer cans – great for targeting males again – they line the cans with it. There's been many exposés on it now. The CBC in Canada, which is a government-owned television station – it's the BBC basically of Canada – did a documentary series called The Disappearing Male. And it goes through all of that in that particular talk, with proof.

Also, when you back to the writings of Lord Bertrand Russell, and Julian Huxley and Aldous Huxley – who were also related to the Darwins by the way – you'll find that they talked about ways to sterilize the populations, in the '30s, '40s and '50s. And they even said they would use the needle to create a compliant pliable population – we need to dumb down the people and also to bring down the fertility rates. In the 1950s across Europe and the Americas what came out, under vast promotion, what came out? The polio vaccine came out. That was the first one ever to come out through a mass fear campaign, a massive fear campaign. Polio was very very rare, yet if you go back to the old Pathé black-and-white newsreels that they showed all over the world at the time, they showed you the same one boy in the iron lung, and that terrified the whole world. How many polio cases were actually there? Was it really polio?

We do know that from those first shots, those injections, the generation that got them all ended up carrying 100 simian viruses, live simian viruses in the shot. And Simian 40 only had one function according to the maker – the discoverer of the vaccine – and that was to cause cancer. And I also have a copy of the discussion with this particular man and his staff admitting that. They knew that at the time. What they said was that they thought the benefits outweighed the bad, risks that might come along down the road. That was their excuse.

Since then we've been trained to accept more and more inoculations until babies now get something like 30 inoculations before they're out the hospital. When you look into the big manufacturers of inoculations, like Baxter Laboratories which was in the news recently because they sent out a live flu virus along with the bird flu virus mixed together and were caught by another country who had tested it on ferrets and the ferrets all died – they had done the very thing that they say they're worried about happening in nature, where the common flu is mixed with a killer flu and becomes highly contagious. They actually did it by mistake, we're told.

Go back into Baxter Laboratories even further and you'll find Baxter Laboratories was part of the I.G. Farben group in World War II. They were responsible for creating chemicals and so on that were used as gas, and they were also used in other medical experiments on prisoners. That's in the records of the inquiry that went on into I.G. Farben. A good book to read is *The Crimes and Punishment of I.G. Farben*. All of that stuff is documented in there. All of the companies, the Western corporations that were involved in the setting up of the Hitler regime are mentioned in that book. And Baxter Laboratories – the one that is coming out with all the shots we have to take, supposedly for the swine flu – is still on the go.

When you go into Connaught Laboratories as an example, Connaught Laboratories was employed during World War II to manufacture bacterium and viruses, fungus that would attack wheat and corn etc. in Germany. Mr. [Frederick] Banting who discovered insulin – the great hero Banting – during World War II his main occupation was finding ways to annihilate the food supply of an entire country. And he came up with ideas of creating a form of what we now call mad cow disease – something that rotted the brains of the cattle for herds; dairy herds and beef herds – and it was manufactured in World War II. And I often wonder, if there really is such a thing as mad cow disease, is that where it came from?

These big laboratories and Connaught Laboratories eventually became responsible for instance for the blood supply for hospitals and haemophiliacs, and by-products of blood supply for Canada. When Mr. Clinton was in power he signed a deal with some prisons in the US, where the prisoners would get a dollar or two for a pint of blood, and this stuff was all to be sold to Canada. And almost every haemophiliac in Canada, everyone who got the blood supply came down with Hepatitis and various other diseases. The government held about a 10 year inquiry, waiting till they were all pretty well dead, maybe one or two survived, before they paid out compensation. They knew at the very beginning that this blood was contaminated, and there's Connaught Laboratories – part of the military-industrial complex used in World War II – buying the blood and selling it and distributing it across Canada. When the CBC did a documentary on Connaught Laboratories and their role in this, the little guy who purchased it was caught on the steps of his office of the building, and he turned round and he said to the camera crew, who had questioned him on all the deaths that were caused in Canada, thousands of them, he said "it's business." That was the only reply given.

I've said for many years that the biggest international corporations are real corporations, but they're also front groups for one system. During the Cold War for instance, many books were published on the war, how it would be won and so on, and what they all agreed upon was those with the highest technologies would win. Now, if you were in a free enterprise system you could never allow inventions coming out of nowhere, unauthorized – especially in communications and different means – to be given to the general public. Therefore the CIA, MI6 and other countries' agencies created front organizations to lead the charge and control technology.

You could never allow free competition in technology and give it to the people without authorization. It has to be permitted by those who rule. That goes across the board with everything, as I say from those who rule. You create culture, you manipulate culture, you give the public what you deign to give them, you suppress that which you don't want the public to have. It must be under control. You cannot have that with a true free market enterprise and true entrepreneurialism – you can't have it, therefore you put up the front companies. They are real companies; they will really manufacture stuff, but it's what's been authorized. And guys at the top, CIA, MI6 fund them and run them.

We've seen this with different banks that were set up by the CIA in the past, where they funnel money to all the major wars they were fighting. The BCCI was one of the first ones that collapsed – Papa Bush was a director at one time, and then he was back to being director of the CIA. These were front massive banks, massive corporations.

A difficult thing for some people to understand is that what's happening today is not just an elite making a final move to take over anything. Every generation for hundreds of years has been brought up with the same elite's predecessors, designing and running the show for each generation. The elite in fact, are simply moving their system into a new system, an updated system to suit themselves. That's a hard concept for people to grasp. They've been trained to believe things are happening at the moment by happenstance, by crises coming out of nowhere and here's what we must do, we must solve this problem at the time. Nothing is further from the truth.

And when people wake up they generally go through the same stages as someone who becomes bereaved, when you find that democracy never existed in the first place. You go through an anger phase, a depression phase, you'll blame whoever's handy. And then hopefully you emerge from it and become active, and you want to learn what's going on, and what has been going on.

You'll also eventually come to the realization that you're up against something, a system that's very very old; it's the only truly organized system on the whole planet. It uses sciences that are ancient, in population management. It gave us the system of money – money is a tool that we must believe in to serve them. Karl Marx was quite right; he was one of their boys, who was set up to set up the dialectic,

and he was quite right when he said that money is a tool of the elite. It's essential that the people who stop bartering or working for themselves and start using money as a means of exchange – which then can be taxed back from them – are becoming slaves. Because under law and legality, for a thousand years, no-one could take anything from you.

Money represents your food, your home, everything. When it's taxed back from you, they're creating a form of slavery. Therefore it's essential that the workers believe in money. The elite have all the money in the world; they own all the resources in the world. They don't need money. But they need us to believe that it's the only thing that we must use. Today the power of the purse, as they call it at the top, is being used to the maximum to tax almost everything back from the people that they earn.

You tie that in with Charles Galton Darwin and his book *The Next Million Years*, where he lays out the next few thousand years up to a million years for the elite, and all the changes that will happen – the grandson of Charles Darwin, who again, was related to the Huxleys and many others. And he said, in the 1950s in his own book "slavery has always existed in one form or another." There's different ways to have slavery. You can either get a bunch of henchmen, force a tribe into obeying you and being your slaves – that's a lot of force, but you have to feed them etc. Or you can allow them to keep so much of their earnings for themselves, to maintain themselves, and take off all the rest to supply the elite and the structure of the system over them. But he said "we are now in the process of creating a more sophisticated form of slavery".

In other words the general public, who would drift into this system – and it would become natural for them – would never twig on that they were actually slaves. You tie that in with the institutions that the Huxleys and the Darwins belonged to. The Royal Institute of International Affairs which has branches in every country in the world – they set up the United Nations. They said in their own writings from the earliest times to the present, the world they're bringing in is to be a world where everyone who is born (or would be allowed to be born) would be born to serve the state. That would be their sole function – that's if they had a job for you to fulfill, or a need for you. But it's a more sophisticated form of slavery, and we're going through it today.

These families have been at this for at least centuries, and I think much much longer. Why is it that the Rothschilds come onto the scene as a revolutionary family? Why is it that they suddenly could take over five countries with five sons, create central banks or take the central banks over that already existed? And why is it that right to the present time they're in the forefront of world politics? Why is that? Why doesn't a generation of the Rothschilds go off in some other direction or lose interest? You're dealing here with a specific religion – a religion and a cause, a purpose. You will only find this kind of fanatical intergenerational devotion to an agenda when there's some kind of a religion involved in it.

When did all these families crop up, with the banks? We find that when the Rosicrucian Court was created at Queen Elizabeth I's court – and that's open history today; John Dee, Francis Bacon, Francis Drake, all these boys were members of the Rosicrucians. It also broke out in France and Germany at the same time, and they even announced their presence by billboards all across Paris. The members in Britain were open in the time of Queen Elizabeth I. Their idea was to gain gold and money through plunder. And they basically lived off of the Spanish galleons for an awful long time, as the Spanish were taking the gold out of South America.

John Dee and Bacon were also advisors to kings and queens, and they wrote about how to control, guide, mislead and always fool the populations, and always too to get them into warfare, thinking they knew what they were fighting for – but the public were never to know the true ambitions that they had. John Dee coined the term “the British Empire”. It didn't exist before he said it and wrote it down. He went to the queen with the idea and he said a system should be set up where countries are invaded or taken over by Britain to create a world system, which would be based on free trade. Free Trade. He said those countries willing to adopt the British system would be given special status, and its most favoured nation trading status. The very same terms that are now used in all the charters they draw up for free trade across the planet, yet we're going back 500 years to find it first used by an advisor to Queen Elizabeth I. So therefore we know there was a world plan under way.

We also know that Kipling for instance – who worked for the British Raj in India, wrote many books and was a very high freemason – was sent over to the US where he spoke to the US Senate, equal to equal, and said “we pass the torch on to you”. America was then to take over the financial cost of conducting this world war basically, to take over a world and turn it into a global system.

I'm Alan Watt and I'm a long-term researcher into the geopolitics and the psychopolitics of a world society basically; the society that's bringing in globalism in our lifetime.

In the 1950s a book came out called The Next Million Years, and that was done by Charles Galton Darwin. The Galtons again were another special bunch that came out to do with eugenics. They started up the I.Q. tests that are now used across the world for schoolchildren to try and get the average intellect of children, classify them in grades, etc. And they then intermarried with the Darwins. So Charles Galton Darwin was the grandson of Charles Darwin. He was a physicist.

Again too, what we're talking about is what Huxley said – Huxley being the end product of selective breeding to get a scientist, and so was Charles Galton Darwin. They were bred along the Platonic lines –

Plato talked about it too – and they became the scientific class. Charles Galton Darwin was a top physicist in Britain, worked on atomic energy, weaponry and so on. He also was attached to other delegations at the United Nations, had a lot of power, was well known, given a lot of exposure on political viewpoints and social viewpoints in the media. And he came out with the book in the 1950s called *The Next Million Years*.

The Next Million Years is an astonishing book because it's an incredible boast of how an elite would literally rule the world for another million years, and how it would be done – not just could be done, but would be done. And his biggest cry throughout the whole book was that the media and educational systems would have to work so hard on the general public, even from schooling up, to get the public to go along and allow themselves to be somehow sterilized. He said that the inferiors would outbreed the superiors, and that was his greatest fear. Now, he spoke on behalf of his own establishment, his own group.

So they were into eugenics. And you'll find the United States became a great laboratory for eugenical experiment – people don't really realize that. Because when many of the Albigenian descendants, the Cathar descendants, the Bogomil descendants, came into the United States under the guise of Christianity, they set up their own particular eugenical experiments. The Mormons were one of them, where couples were matched up.

One of the greatest experiments that's ever happened in history was the Oneida experiment – Oneida, New York – where the man who set it up was given free reign to match up men and women, not to live forever together, but only to copulate for specific offspring. Charles Darwin was involved in the experiment. The newsletter that the Oneidas set out went also to the Huxleys. H.G. Wells came over at the latter end for visits to it as well. It was one of the greatest eugenical experiments ever carried on, under the protection and the guise, and the rights of protection of Christianity. That's how they got away with it. And the man – [John Humphrey] Noyes – who was in charge of it, was a high mason. His cousin was [Rutherford B.] Hayes, who became the president of the United States – so big people were backing this experiment in eugenics through the latter part of the 1800s into the 1900s.

What did they hope to gain? How can we bring this into the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, or the writings of say the Huxleys, or the Darwins even? Well they believe, and they believed by Darwin's time that all of the people who had "the right stuff" to excel in life, to acquire wealth, good intellect, property, and keep a hold of it through generations, had already been born. Therefore anything that came after Darwin was just chance perhaps, or luck. Therefore all the elite families were already established; there would be no more elite families. Everyone else married in common because they did not have their wives or their husbands picked for them – they were not mated up for eugenical reasons. They were called 'commoners'.

We find the same expression coming out today with the new term for eugenics, they call it bioethics. And the bioethicists are saying that those people, the common people, have “junk genes”. It’s another slander on the public you see, meaning you have all these weird erroneous genes because none of you down through the generations were specifically married up for specific reasons. Whereas you go into the lineage of Darwin, and the Darwin family (and many other families of his time) were already only breeding in to one other family for generations. And the Darwins for about five generations – that we know of by birth records and marriage records – only married into the Wedgwood family, the big pottery conglomerate. And when Charles Darwin’s first wife died he married his mother’s sister, who was a Wedgwood as well.

The problem with this incredibly close inbreeding, and I should say too the Huxleys were also descended from Darwin too – you’ll find contacts there – and their wives. How many of these families, these wealthy elite families were actually into inbreeding in this fashion, this close inbreeding, we’ll never really know. Maybe one day they will publish it. But I know that Ian Taylor came out with an excellent book on Darwin called *In The Minds Of Men – Darwin and the New World Order*, where he documented the lineages of at least the Darwin family, to do with the Wedgwoods. And as I say the unfortunate thing of such close inbreeding is that if there’s a dominant gene there prone to a specific illness or disease, it tends to be passed on. And I think that with genetic research they hope to overcome the problems they’ve had with such close inbreeding for themselves. But genetic research will not be used for the benefit of the rest of humanity, even though it’s our tax money that’s going into it, and has been going into the research for so long. How long have they been working and why have they been working so long on genetics? What’s the reason for it?

--

All geneticists are eugenicists because it starts off in your first course to do with eugenics, superior and inferior types. Therefore at the start of their training at university they become true believers in eugenics to begin with.

We’ve been told the double helix and the genes and so on, wasn’t discovered until Watson came along around the ‘70s or so. And that they’d always suspected that there were things called genes – this was standard in all medical training for many many many years – but they hadn’t found them. They just suspected they were there, we’re told. But yet if you go into the writings of the greatest mathematician that the Royal Society could produce called [Ernest] Rutherford – he’s the guy they sent off abroad to do the equations for the pyramids and so on, for the Royal Society – in his own memoirs he said that in the early ‘20s he was employed on scientific research as a mathematician to work on genes. Why would you need mathematicians working on genes for something you haven’t discovered yet? You can’t see them, unless they could see them. And I believe that’s how far ahead they truly were back then. They did know

the genes were there. They were working on them heavily because the agenda since at least Darwin's time onwards was to create a superior type of human.

They toyed with the idea of creating even a superior type of worker, to serve the superior class; someone who could be very very healthy, bright enough to accomplish all the tasks but not too bright to overthrow the dominant minority. That's what their utopia, or their utopic idea, is basically based upon. Some of them are so arrogant, like Julian Huxley; who was the first CEO of UNESCO, who said that UNESCO'S function by the way – the United Nation's organization for education worldwide – was to create a standardized system of education across the world so that all children could be manipulated into the same thought patterns, belief patterns and mentality basically – a standardization process; a Plato's cave that we'd all grow up in, never knowing anything outside of that cave. He was quite blatant about that. It was for social engineering purposes, not for educational purposes as such.

Now eugenics goes back into the most ancient times. All kings and queens were mated up – for their supposedly inherited traits as leaders, and even as gods – by the priesthoods, who kept records of the traits, the physical and mental personality traits of offspring of these unions. The one thing that was lacking was a monied class, who also use the same techniques. We find this coming out with the Rothschild family. So you had monarchies running the world, running an empire such as the British Empire. All you needed now was the monied system to go along with it. We find the Rothschilds worked on the same principals as monarchies; they inter-married each other to keep the same intellect, abilities and so on going. With the Rothschilds we find they only marry their nieces, their immediate nieces, down through the generations.

We find Benjamin Franklin, very interesting man, long before this, again, high freemason – this is in his own records at the Franklin Institute; he joined the English lodge, he joined other lodges, he became eventually the Grand Master of the Nine Sisters lodge in France. He initiated Voltaire in as a member, and others, but he was also a member of the Hellfire Club in England. Benjamin Franklin talked about the carriers; he called them 'dollies'. These are women who had selective genes. They were the products themselves of selective special breeding. And the Hellfire Club, like many high masonic institutions of that time, had what were loosely called – loosely called and wrongly in a sense – brothels attached to them. But it was also a cover because the special carriers or 'dollies' – and dolly is the term that Franklin himself coined, it's still in use today; a dolly is a carrier like something you carry luggage on or whatever – basically he said that those who are worthy to go on and breed with these particular women (who were of noble birth most of them) would have the pleasure of having the offspring, knowing they had the offspring and the offspring was guaranteed a life of high exposure in science and perhaps leadership in the world. Madame Bouvier was the one he was talking about initially at the Hellfire Club – it's in High Wycombe, London. And Madame Bouvier's descendants still live; there's two of them in France today, and the other one was Jackie Kennedy.

If you look at how politics is run, and you go into the writings of people like Lenin for instance, Lenin said that there are a thousand directions and systems in which people could go and live under, but the public mustn't know that. He said it's important that the system that's created for them is accepted by the people so that they think that it's the only system that could possibly work. And it's true; we're contained in a system of left and right, supposedly the have-nots against the haves, or those who own the means of production against those who don't; the workers. And that's traditional Labour versus Tory or Conservative versus Democrat – that's how the system is run. It keeps the public contained within a system of thinking that it must be one or the other, or a middle road in between, which they push. It never occurs to the general public that society has lived in the past under many different types of systems. And as Lenin said, it's important that the public don't know that the system they were born into was designed for them and that it could be any different; they must think it's the only natural one that could have evolved in their lifetime.

Therefore you're contained within a restriction of parties. You vote in one party when you're sick of the last one – not because you want the new one in, it's because you're sick of the last one and what they've done to you. And once they've been corrupted and gone off in different tangents – in ways which they never explain during the entire elections, and nothing to do with their election promises – you vote them out and get the next party in. And so we go on forever with this left-right paradigm. It's like a tennis match really with the public in the middle; we're the ball, and we just simply go back and forth between left and right, left and right, left and right. Meanwhile, we're being shepherded all along in one direction, because politics is a tool of the elite to manage the public. That's all democracy in fact really is; a tool of the elite to contain the public, manage them, and guide them along a pre-determined path that's outside of any kind of democracy.

If you take Bush, what he was sent in to do was to wait. And I believe this truly; he was to wait for 9/11 happening in 2001. 2001 happened, every country automatically went on board with the same agenda, at the same time, which shows pre-planning – bureaucracies in different governments do not work that fast. It takes years to get that kind of cooperation, that kind of synchronicity working together, in synchronization. Bush's job was to bring in a totalitarian system – under the guise of protecting the public – where you lose your rights, and set up the machinery, the agencies to do it; the military forces, the paramilitary forces now (that the police have become) to set up the institutions for enforcement of laws. Obama comes in, takes over the institutions that are now set up, and his job is to guide you through the economic depression and use those forces against the public at the required time. That's how it works. It's a continuity as far as I'm concerned; it's not a separate regime whatsoever. The same boys who put Bush in – the bankers and all the rest of it – put Obama in. And Obama's proved his loyalty to them by literally allowing them to rape the public of all their funds and then rewarding them by public

funding and tax money to save the same bankers. He's one of their own boys. But he now has the machinery in place that Bush set up to quell the coming riots – that they say are going to come – and to manage the public into a brand new system of what they call not government but governance, international governance.

If you listen to Obama's speeches before he was elected and analyze what he actually said, he said very little. He was giving emotive speeches with no substance. He never said what he wanted to do or how he's going to do anything. It was almost like a lead up to a movie that hadn't been made yet; emotional talk, talk of hope, but not saying how the hope would be transformed into realities. He used the term that's been used in academia for the last few decades, in the Ivy League schools and universities, of "the century of change". So his slogan became – and they use slogans, written for them – "change is good". Any idiot should ask the simple question "wait a minute, what change are you talking about?" How can you be for change if you don't know what the change is going to be? It could be for your detriment.

But they got the people parroting like George Orwell said with the sheep, you know "four legs good, two legs bad", "change is good" and the people, his followers start to repeat it; "change is good". What kind of change are we talking about? The loss of sovereignty? The blending into an international institution? A world government system? A system where not only is America bankrupt and the most indebted nation on the planet – for loaning money out to other countries and policing the world, being the policeman of the world – now Obama wants to lead the charge on sustainability, carbon taxes, by making America the example for the rest of the world to follow. He's asking everybody to sacrifice everything they have. That's what he means by "change is good".

He didn't dream up this plan. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Again, that comes from the Milner Group, the Cecil Rhodes society, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, that planned world government using the British Empire as the model – which has now become the American Empire in a sense. And the change he is talking about is a new world of servitude, where you will serve the world state. And you will also have to pay off all your debts along the way, which is impossible as far as I'm concerned; you cannot ever pay the kind of debt America has incurred since World War II. It's impossible to pay back.

Therefore the change he's talking about really is a New Deal. When you hear a new deal mentioned by any president – and we got that from FDR, we got it from Bush, the last Bush that was in, a new deal, we're getting it from this administration – that's a legal admission; a legal admission from the leader of your country of a new system. A new deal is literally a new system. The first system was the constitution, you got an updated system with FDR as government became incredibly big and centralized, and now you've got a new deal under the guise that change is good.

Who planned the change? It wasn't the people who planned the change. Who will benefit? It will not be the people; it's the world of sustainability, Mr. [David] Rockefeller, the population reduction plan. Those who will go into the future will be those who are necessary for the future's maintenance, and those who are simply obsolete – the 'useless eaters' – will have to perish and die off. It's as simple as that.

This generation today, the ones who are alive today, we are the generation that's going through the biggest changes in history – according to even Rockefeller himself – since the industrial revolution. It's the end of one part, one phase of a long-term plan. And out of this comes a new world order, as they've said. Mr. [Gordon] Brown said – the [previous] Prime Minister of Great Britain – said at the G20 meeting recently "it's a new world order"; a different order from the previous one, where people technically, technically were working for themselves, would choose their own employment and so on. The new world order is a planned system, a planned economy, a planned population.

So it's up to us – it's not up to the next generation – to change this. We're the only ones who can possibly do the changing. And it's either really the right to go into an uncertain future – which is what life should really be – where we decide for ourselves where we want to go individually and collectively, or allow ourselves to be dumb animals; creatures who are guided by those who have decided they are the masters of our destiny, and allow ourselves gradually to be sterilized, killed off, used for the last part of their agenda and their wars, and then cast off.

Many people will love socialism. They enjoy being guided and they enjoy their bosses running the world for them. But it's up to those who like freedom, personal freedom, which also entails uncertainty of where we're actually going to go.

October 22, 2025 at 7:43 am

[EDIT](#) | [MOVE](#) | [SPLIT](#) | [TRASH](#) | [SPAM](#) | [UNAPPROVE](#) | [REPLY](#) [#921](#)



The Neo-Eugenics War On Humanity

by Alan Watt

Alan
Keymaster
(127.0.0.1)

I'm Alan Watt and I'm an author and researcher into geopolitics really, and history. I follow where the world has been, the techniques that were used to bring us to those stages and I apply them to where we are today, and how the future is planned.

I've researched so many books; I've got a library of my own. I like paperback books or at least hardback books because they're permanent records of the past, and if you can't understand the past you won't understand the present or the future.

I've also been in the music business, heavily involved for years. And I saw how culture creation worked from the top, and how generations were swayed into new fashions, new ideas.

I've been following the histories of what's now called "the new world order" for many many years, and I try to go into the books written by the big players; the technocrats themselves – those famous people, like the Kissingers, the Brzezinskis and so on, the Huxleys, the Lord Bertrand Russells, who all worked for the same organizations. And I came to the conclusion really that there was only one big organization with many sub-categories. These boys tend to publish the world that they saw coming into view and they wrote it in their own hand basically. They told us where they were taking the world.

And when you start studying these things about the age of 14-15, or even younger, and reading their books – and you live long enough – you will see that the world has turned out exactly as they planned. This can't be coincidence. And who can really write up a wish list and make it happen, globally, unless there is an organization? Very very powerful, probably the only organization really on the planet. An organization that can fund all sides, all oppositions, and using this synthesis of conflicting parties, they can literally make the world come into view as they planned.

They plan in centuries. And the astonishing thing is when you go into the United Nations, which was loosely based on the Soviet system, they plan certain parts of their agenda in 50 year plans, some in 100 year plans, and some even in 150 year plans for different aspects of it. The Russells, the Huxleys, Brzezinskis and so on, also use the same terminology with their long-term plans.

And you've got to understand too that nothing in culture comes out from the grass roots. Even Plato talked about that thousands of years ago. He said that if it was a grass roots movement really coming from the people, then those in charge – the dominant minority – would lose control. Therefore every change in culture, right down to fashion and music – and this was written 2,300 years ago – had to be authorized from the top, and promoted from the top, if it fitted with the continuance of control over the public.

And these are sciences which were taught down through the ages (they're still taught today, to the big players) and they've used it to the full in the 20th century, now into the 21st century with the use of television, mass communications, radio etc. Everything has been given to us for the appropriate time and stage in the actual planning.

For those who are coming into this kind of study, it's best to go into the books written by the big players themselves. They love to boast. [Henry] Kissinger's got lots of books out there, so has [Zbigniew] Brzezinski. These are probably two of the master players in geopolitics. Try to stay away from all the conspiracy books that are also put out there on purpose – very fascinating books, but they lead you in circles forever without giving you the overall picture to the fact that every generation has a purpose, up until this present time.

And in a post-industrial era these “big boys” have decided, and their masters too, that we are simply superfluous and they no longer need us. Hence we have big foundations coming forward and organizations like the Optimum Population Trust, who have decided to come out openly and demand that governments start radically reducing the populations. We are now the “useless eaters”, as Lord Bertrand Russell called us.

Our ideas, our opinions on everything, our world view, even to do with population – and the fake view that we're over-populated – is all projected to us by the mainstream media, working in concert for their masters. And we begin to parrot what we hear through repetition – and that's so important; it's repetition with slogans and catchphrases. And once you hear it happening in your own local group, your milieu, then you know it's working.

And the camera can make anything appear to be true. You'll see that in India for instance, they always use the same streets of Bombay, to make you think that you're massively overcrowded, and that's the impression people think of the entire Indian continent. The Indian continent is huge with thousands and thousands of miles of forest, where no-one lives. It's the same in Africa too.

China, being the model state for the world for instance, put into effect the United Nations policy to the extreme, with its population reduction and the movement of people off of the rural areas into cities. They started that years ago. Right now they're in the process of moving two hundred million more people off into the major cities, and that's in the major newspapers.

The cities appear to be crowded because everyone's being moved into them. In the Western world since the 1950s again under the term of “urban sprawl” and stopping urban sprawl, the Western countries also signed agreements to do no more building in the outskirts of the major cities. All existing buildings have to be used or else knocked down and replaced with even higher ones, but regardless with the immigration and the free flow of people now from third world countries, the Western countries appear to be overcrowded.

And yet the UN's own statistics show, and so do the national censuses show, that the Europeans for instance, and Canadians and Americans – who have been here for a couple of hundred years – are actually in decline. So the over-population problem is simply an image projected by the media, as more and more people are crammed into the same cities and they bring more immigrants in to fill them.

I also realized the system of schooling, when I was going to school, was bogus. The histories were bogus and I was very very lucky to have access to very old libraries, very old town libraries. Some of them had reference books going back into the 1700s, written at the time. When you compared the histories I was being taught in school to the histories that were written at the time, they were completely different. You had a deeper understanding of how geopolitics had been used in the past to even populate the country of Canada. London couldn't get immigrants to go off into the new colonies.

What they did for Australia was to create so many laws that you couldn't help but break them – and poverty. And therefore stealing a loaf of bread to feed you or your family would get you deported to Australia, with your family. That's how they populated Australia; crime. They created the laws for crime. With Scotland we had a rebellion, which could have been rigged – and I often think it was – and the whole of Scotland was punished. And they deported millions of the Scots off to the Americas, to populate the Americas. This is geopolitics in action. That's how it works. And whole peoples are often moved from their land because the elite masters want them elsewhere to be productive, for them themselves, the masters.

When you look at the strategy for the US and Canada – again long-term strategy, long-term planning – you'll find that the big corporations of their day, the Hudson's Bay companies, the Fraser companies, were given charters to own the land before Canada was Canada or the US was the US; they were simply called the Americas. These were private international corporations that had the power of life and death over everyone who lived within their areas. The queen or the king had a consulate in every country, lieutenant general or governor general they call them. They still have one in Canada today, who represents the queen. They have all the powers over life and death of subjects under that governor.

How they stopped rebellion in the past was to give us an idea of what they called democracy. They knew from the Chartist movement in Britain for instance, and elsewhere in other countries, people were demanding rights for the first time. And so once again they gave us champions to speak on our behalf which calmed the people down, thinking for the first time in history the people were involved in their own destiny creation. And nothing was further from the truth. Because the planners knew that once you bring people into a country or continent, create real wealth for them and get businesses going, clear the land, drain the swamps and so on, they can take it all away from you through laws 200 years down the road. And that's what's happening now; long-term geopolitics once more.

And if you think I'm kidding about this go into the history books written at the time – they're still there in some of the libraries. And you can also go into the art of geopolitics. There are even videos on youtube of Brzezinski boasting about how he set up the Taliban in Afghanistan. You'll see him encourage them to fight the Soviets at that time in the 1970s, and he actually says "yours is a holy war." This man, who obviously believes in nothing but himself and his own peer group, is encouraging another people to go and fight a holy war, a jihad – and he uses these terms – against the Soviets, knowing full well once it was set up and it was backed by the CIA, that 10-15 years down the road, they'd be a problem. And then they'd have to go to war with the very group they'd created to fight the Soviets. That's what's happening today; long-term strategies. Well that's how history has always been run.

If you can go into the books where you find the British Home Office is mentioned, study the history of the Diplomatic Corps, because their diplomats were spies. They would go into territories, set up embassies and collect intelligence data for future invasions. Their job was also to try and grab the rights of minerals, gold, silver, etc. across the planet, all natural resources, and find ways, long-term strategy, to either bribe it off the present rulers of those countries or else create an ultimate war with them and simply steal it, under the guise of occupation.

We're living through a stage today where this is all coming to a culmination. This is the post-industrial era. We're post-technical almost in the West; it's all done in other countries, all the technical stuff. And Brzezinski himself talks about the technocratic era, where the future will be for an elite with a highly trained bureaucracy underneath them and scientific elite, who will not need the human labour that was needed in the past.

Human labour that is excessive, and is unemployed, and is hungry, is now a threat to that established elite. So now they're doing something which they can only do to the human species. They don't need to do this with animals; with animals they just go out and hunt them and kill them. We're the only species that has to be convinced to allow ourselves, for the good of all, to be sterilized and bring down the population, through abortion on one end, and euthanasia on the other, under the guise to save the planet. And unfortunately with the massive propaganda campaigns that are all over media, in every country at the same time, with all the big foundations backing them with unlimited financing – remember too, the foundations are owned by the international bankers themselves – then they can pull all of this off. And unfortunately it really is working.

In kindergarten now, you walk into a kindergarten anywhere in Europe or Americas, and you'll see the rainbow inside every single one of them. You'll see all of the terms about the world – here's the globe, 'we're all global' – and you'll see the greening messages everywhere, everywhere, and how sacrifice will have to be made to save the world and the planet and future generations of society. Sacrifice.

You tie that together with the institutions that were comprised of the Fabian society, which was a member of the Royal Institute of International Affairs – that's one society. The Council on Foreign Relations is also the same thing as the Royal Institute of International Affairs. They are what Thatcher and Professor Carroll Quigley called "the parallel government". They have told us what the future is going to be. Some of their members have even written books about the need to cull off massive amounts of the population by any means possible. And so we see this final stage being pushed as they convince us that we are the problem.

The Club of Rome also belongs to the same group. In the 1990s the two founders said that back in the 1970s at the Club of Rome, they were given the task as the premier think-tank for the globe, for this global society, the task to find ways of reducing the population and controlling the people to go along with this, convincing the public how to go along with it. And they said they'd looked at all possible means of doing so, what had worked before? – Again, geopolitics, strategy. Under warfare conditions the public will give up freedom.

The public will be directed by governments, bureaucracies and police, military, etc. Under warfare the public sacrifice, they'll have less food, they'll ration stuff; they go along with it to save themselves. Therefore, they'd have to find a warfare strategy – a reason for war. And what they came up with was that man was the enemy of the planet. They said the idea that global warming could be created and blamed upon mankind would fit the bill. These are the words they used; "that would fit the bill". Written in the 1970s and decided at the think-tanks then, and published [in 1991] by the guys involved in a book called *The First Global Revolution*, well worth reading.

When they hit upon an idea from a premier think-tank, they will never change that agenda. I've said before it wouldn't matter if we were up to our eyes in snow all year round, they will still stick to global warming – that's the agenda. Now of course they've changed it slightly to "climate change", which simply means changes in the weather. And they're in the process now of convincing the general public to be afraid of summer, for instance. It's all done through the alteration and distortion of perceptions. Massive psychology is used on all of this, and they certainly understand mass psychology of the general public.

These boys don't simply announce things or make up a wish list of the future and send it up the chimney to Santa Claus. When they come up with an idea, they implement it. I've followed the United Nations Department of Statistics as they announce every single year the sperm count of the Western male, which has been falling drastically since the 1950s. They say that it's down by about 75-85%. Now when something like that's happened across the whole of Europe and the Americas in 50 years and they suddenly started noticing it, sudden onset, and there's no crisis made about it, there's no comeback after announcing the statistics, they just tell you the cold hard statistics and go off to the next statistic on

some other topic – that means it's part of the agenda, otherwise it would be a crisis. If this wasn't planned and part of the agenda, believe you me it would be a crisis if they didn't authorize it.

And now they tell us that the average American has less than 20% sperm and only about 15% is motile. That's not a coincidence. What happened in the 1950s to start this ball rolling? In the 1950s they suddenly put all the known female synthetic estrogens into the food supply. They put it in baby food. Procter & Gamble were the first ones to admit after investigation, 40 years later, that they were using a rinse to supposedly sterilize the baby bottles, and it contained Bisphenol A – an odd thing to rinse baby bottles with, when Bisphenol A is the very thing that attacks young male children at that age, and stops the testes from developing properly.

You go back even further into more detail and you find out that the cosmetic industry was using insufflatants. Insufflation is a technique where certain carriers are put into the creams themselves, and these creams then absorb into the skin carrying other chemicals with them. They're almost like the payloads – they carry the payloads into the target in the bloodstream. We find that the women were highly toxic with the artificial Bisphenol A and other ingredients, and therefore within the first 8-12 weeks of pregnancy with a male child there was a very good chance that male would grow up to be either almost completely sterile or as I say maybe have some motile sperm.

This was all understood 50 years ago. Bisphenol A for instance, was discovered in the 1890s. And the properties it had against humans, especially males, was known then too. Now it's in all the beer cans – great for targeting males again – they line the cans with it. There's been many exposés on it now. The CBC in Canada, which is a government-owned television station – it's the BBC basically of Canada – did a documentary series called The Disappearing Male. And it goes through all of that in that particular talk, with proof.

Also, when you back to the writings of Lord Bertrand Russell, and Julian Huxley and Aldous Huxley – who were also related to the Darwins by the way – you'll find that they talked about ways to sterilize the populations, in the '30s, '40s and '50s. And they even said they would use the needle to create a compliant pliable population – we need to dumb down the people and also to bring down the fertility rates. In the 1950s across Europe and the Americas what came out, under vast promotion, what came out? The polio vaccine came out. That was the first one ever to come out through a mass fear campaign, a massive fear campaign. Polio was very very rare, yet if you go back to the old Pathé black-and-white newsreels that they showed all over the world at the time, they showed you the same one boy in the iron lung, and that terrified the whole world. How many polio cases were actually there? Was it really polio?

We do know that from those first shots, those injections, the generation that got them all ended up carrying 100 simian viruses, live simian viruses in the shot. And Simian 40 only had one function

according to the maker – the discoverer of the vaccine – and that was to cause cancer. And I also have a copy of the discussion with this particular man and his staff admitting that. They knew that at the time. What they said was that they thought the benefits outweighed the bad, risks that might come along down the road. That was their excuse.

Since then we've been trained to accept more and more inoculations until babies now get something like 30 inoculations before they're out the hospital. When you look into the big manufacturers of inoculations, like Baxter Laboratories which was in the news recently because they sent out a live flu virus along with the bird flu virus mixed together and were caught by another country who had tested it on ferrets and the ferrets all died – they had done the very thing that they say they're worried about happening in nature, where the common flu is mixed with a killer flu and becomes highly contagious. They actually did it by mistake, we're told.

Go back into Baxter Laboratories even further and you'll find Baxter Laboratories was part of the I.G. Farben group in World War II. They were responsible for creating chemicals and so on that were used as gas, and they were also used in other medical experiments on prisoners. That's in the records of the inquiry that went on into I.G. Farben. A good book to read is *The Crimes and Punishment of I.G. Farben*. All of that stuff is documented in there. All of the companies, the Western corporations that were involved in the setting up of the Hitler regime are mentioned in that book. And Baxter Laboratories – the one that is coming out with all the shots we have to take, supposedly for the swine flu – is still on the go.

When you go into Connaught Laboratories as an example, Connaught Laboratories was employed during World War II to manufacture bacterium and viruses, fungus that would attack wheat and corn etc. in Germany. Mr. [Frederick] Banting who discovered insulin – the great hero Banting – during World War II his main occupation was finding ways to annihilate the food supply of an entire country. And he came up with ideas of creating a form of what we now call mad cow disease – something that rotted the brains of the cattle for herds; dairy herds and beef herds – and it was manufactured in World War II. And I often wonder, if there really is such a thing as mad cow disease, is that where it came from?

These big laboratories and Connaught Laboratories eventually became responsible for instance for the blood supply for hospitals and haemophiliacs, and by-products of blood supply for Canada. When Mr. Clinton was in power he signed a deal with some prisons in the US, where the prisoners would get a dollar or two for a pint of blood, and this stuff was all to be sold to Canada. And almost every haemophiliac in Canada, everyone who got the blood supply came down with Hepatitis and various other diseases. The government held about a 10 year inquiry, waiting till they were all pretty well dead, maybe one or two survived, before they paid out compensation. They knew at the very beginning that this blood was contaminated, and there's Connaught Laboratories – part of the military-industrial complex used in World War II – buying the blood and selling it and distributing it across Canada. When

the CBC did a documentary on Connaught Laboratories and their role in this, the little guy who purchased it was caught on the steps of his office of the building, and he turned round and he said to the camera crew, who had questioned him on all the deaths that were caused in Canada, thousands of them, he said "it's business." That was the only reply given.

I've said for many years that the biggest international corporations are real corporations, but they're also front groups for one system. During the Cold War for instance, many books were published on the war, how it would be won and so on, and what they all agreed upon was those with the highest technologies would win. Now, if you were in a free enterprise system you could never allow inventions coming out of nowhere, unauthorized – especially in communications and different means – to be given to the general public. Therefore the CIA, MI6 and other countries' agencies created front organizations to lead the charge and control technology.

You could never allow free competition in technology and give it to the people without authorization. It has to be permitted by those who rule. That goes across the board with everything, as I say from those who rule. You create culture, you manipulate culture, you give the public what you deign to give them, you suppress that which you don't want the public to have. It must be under control. You cannot have that with a true free market enterprise and true entrepreneurialism – you can't have it, therefore you put up the front companies. They are real companies; they will really manufacture stuff, but it's what's been authorized. And guys at the top, CIA, MI6 fund them and run them.

We've seen this with different banks that were set up by the CIA in the past, where they funnel money to all the major wars they were fighting. The BCCI was one of the first ones that collapsed – Papa Bush was a director at one time, and then he was back to being director of the CIA. These were front massive banks, massive corporations.

A difficult thing for some people to understand is that what's happening today is not just an elite making a final move to take over anything. Every generation for hundreds of years has been brought up with the same elite's predecessors, designing and running the show for each generation. The elite in fact, are simply moving their system into a new system, an updated system to suit themselves. That's a hard concept for people to grasp. They've been trained to believe things are happening at the moment by happenstance, by crises coming out of nowhere and here's what we must do, we must solve this problem at the time. Nothing is further from the truth.

And when people wake up they generally go through the same stages as someone who becomes bereaved, when you find that democracy never existed in the first place. You go through an anger phase, a depression phase, you'll blame whoever's handy. And then hopefully you emerge from it and become active, and you want to learn what's going on, and what has been going on.

You'll also eventually come to the realization that you're up against something, a system that's very very old; it's the only truly organized system on the whole planet. It uses sciences that are ancient, in population management. It gave us the system of money – money is a tool that we must believe in to serve them. Karl Marx was quite right; he was one of their boys, who was set up to set up the dialectic, and he was quite right when he said that money is a tool of the elite. It's essential that the people who stop bartering or working for themselves and start using money as a means of exchange – which then can be taxed back from them – are becoming slaves. Because under law and legality, for a thousand years, no-one could take anything from you.

Money represents your food, your home, everything. When it's taxed back from you, they're creating a form of slavery. Therefore it's essential that the workers believe in money. The elite have all the money in the world; they own all the resources in the world. They don't need money. But they need us to believe that it's the only thing that we must use. Today the power of the purse, as they call it at the top, is being used to the maximum to tax almost everything back from the people that they earn.

You tie that in with Charles Galton Darwin and his book *The Next Million Years*, where he lays out the next few thousand years up to a million years for the elite, and all the changes that will happen – the grandson of Charles Darwin, who again, was related to the Huxleys and many others. And he said, in the 1950s in his own book "slavery has always existed in one form or another." There's different ways to have slavery. You can either get a bunch of henchmen, force a tribe into obeying you and being your slaves – that's a lot of force, but you have to feed them etc. Or you can allow them to keep so much of their earnings for themselves, to maintain themselves, and take off all the rest to supply the elite and the structure of the system over them. But he said "we are now in the process of creating a more sophisticated form of slavery".

In other words the general public, who would drift into this system – and it would become natural for them – would never twig on that they were actually slaves. You tie that in with the institutions that the Huxleys and the Darwins belonged to. The Royal Institute of International Affairs which has branches in every country in the world – they set up the United Nations. They said in their own writings from the earliest times to the present, the world they're bringing in is to be a world where everyone who is born (or would be allowed to be born) would be born to serve the state. That would be their sole function – that's if they had a job for you to fulfill, or a need for you. But it's a more sophisticated form of slavery, and we're going through it today.

These families have been at this for at least centuries, and I think much much longer. Why is it that the Rothschilds come onto the scene as a revolutionary family? Why is it that they suddenly could take over five countries with five sons, create central banks or take the central banks over that already existed? And why is it that right to the present time they're in the forefront of world politics? Why is that? Why

doesn't a generation of the Rothschilds go off in some other direction or lose interest? You're dealing here with a specific religion – a religion and a cause, a purpose. You will only find this kind of fanatical intergenerational devotion to an agenda when there's some kind of a religion involved in it.

When did all these families crop up, with the banks? We find that when the Rosicrucian Court was created at Queen Elizabeth I's court – and that's open history today; John Dee, Francis Bacon, Francis Drake, all these boys were members of the Rosicrucians. It also broke out in France and Germany at the same time, and they even announced their presence by billboards all across Paris. The members in Britain were open in the time of Queen Elizabeth I. Their idea was to gain gold and money through plunder. And they basically lived off of the Spanish galleons for an awful long time, as the Spanish were taking the gold out of South America.

John Dee and Bacon were also advisors to kings and queens, and they wrote about how to control, guide, mislead and always fool the populations, and always too to get them into warfare, thinking they knew what they were fighting for – but the public were never to know the true ambitions that they had. John Dee coined the term "the British Empire". It didn't exist before he said it and wrote it down. He went to the queen with the idea and he said a system should be set up where countries are invaded or taken over by Britain to create a world system, which would be based on free trade. Free Trade. He said those countries willing to adopt the British system would be given special status, and its most favoured nation trading status. The very same terms that are now used in all the charters they draw up for free trade across the planet, yet we're going back 500 years to find it first used by an advisor to Queen Elizabeth I. So therefore we know there was a world plan under way.

We also know that Kipling for instance – who worked for the British Raj in India, wrote many books and was a very high freemason – was sent over to the US where he spoke to the US Senate, equal to equal, and said "we pass the torch on to you". America was then to take over the financial cost of conducting this world war basically, to take over a world and turn it into a global system.

I'm Alan Watt and I'm a long-term researcher into the geopolitics and the psychopolitics of a world society basically; the society that's bringing in globalism in our lifetime.

In the 1950s a book came out called The Next Million Years, and that was done by Charles Galton Darwin. The Galtons again were another special bunch that came out to do with eugenics. They started up the I.Q. tests that are now used across the world for schoolchildren to try and get the average intellect of

children, classify them in grades, etc. And they then intermarried with the Darwins. So Charles Galton Darwin was the grandson of Charles Darwin. He was a physicist.

Again too, what we're talking about is what Huxley said – Huxley being the end product of selective breeding to get a scientist, and so was Charles Galton Darwin. They were bred along the Platonic lines – Plato talked about it too – and they became the scientific class. Charles Galton Darwin was a top physicist in Britain, worked on atomic energy, weaponry and so on. He also was attached to other delegations at the United Nations, had a lot of power, was well known, given a lot of exposure on political viewpoints and social viewpoints in the media. And he came out with the book in the 1950s called *The Next Million Years*.

The Next Million Years is an astonishing book because it's an incredible boast of how an elite would literally rule the world for another million years, and how it would be done – not just could be done, but would be done. And his biggest cry throughout the whole book was that the media and educational systems would have to work so hard on the general public, even from schooling up, to get the public to go along and allow themselves to be somehow sterilized. He said that the inferiors would outbreed the superiors, and that was his greatest fear. Now, he spoke on behalf of his own establishment, his own group.

So they were into eugenics. And you'll find the United States became a great laboratory for eugenical experiment – people don't really realize that. Because when many of the Albigenian descendants, the Cathar descendants, the Bogomil descendants, came into the United States under the guise of Christianity, they set up their own particular eugenical experiments. The Mormons were one of them, where couples were matched up.

One of the greatest experiments that's ever happened in history was the Oneida experiment – Oneida, New York – where the man who set it up was given free reign to match up men and women, not to live forever together, but only to copulate for specific offspring. Charles Darwin was involved in the experiment. The newsletter that the Oneidas set out went also to the Huxleys. H.G. Wells came over at the latter end for visits to it as well. It was one of the greatest eugenical experiments ever carried on, under the protection and the guise, and the rights of protection of Christianity. That's how they got away with it. And the man – [John Humphrey] Noyes – who was in charge of it, was a high mason. His cousin was [Rutherford B.] Hayes, who became the president of the United States – so big people were backing this experiment in eugenics through the latter part of the 1800s into the 1900s.

What did they hope to gain? How can we bring this into the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, or the writings of say the Huxleys, or the Darwins even? Well they believe, and they believed by Darwin's time that all of the people who had "the right stuff" to excel in life, to

acquire wealth, good intellect, property, and keep a hold of it through generations, had already been born. Therefore anything that came after Darwin was just chance perhaps, or luck. Therefore all the elite families were already established; there would be no more elite families. Everyone else married in common because they did not have their wives or their husbands picked for them – they were not mated up for eugenical reasons. They were called ‘commoners’.

We find the same expression coming out today with the new term for eugenics, they call it bioethics. And the bioethicists are saying that those people, the common people, have “junk genes”. It’s another slander on the public you see, meaning you have all these weird erroneous genes because none of you down through the generations were specifically married up for specific reasons. Whereas you go into the lineage of Darwin, and the Darwin family (and many other families of his time) were already only breeding in to one other family for generations. And the Darwins for about five generations – that we know of by birth records and marriage records – only married into the Wedgwood family, the big pottery conglomerate. And when Charles Darwin’s first wife died he married his mother’s sister, who was a Wedgwood as well.

The problem with this incredibly close inbreeding, and I should say too the Huxleys were also descended from Darwin too – you’ll find contacts there – and their wives. How many of these families, these wealthy elite families were actually into inbreeding in this fashion, this close inbreeding, we’ll never really know. Maybe one day they will publish it. But I know that Ian Taylor came out with an excellent book on Darwin called In The Minds Of Men – Darwin and the New World Order, where he documented the lineages of at least the Darwin family, to do with the Wedgwoods. And as I say the unfortunate thing of such close inbreeding is that if there’s a dominant gene there prone to a specific illness or disease, it tends to be passed on. And I think that with genetic research they hope to overcome the problems they’ve had with such close inbreeding for themselves. But genetic research will not be used for the benefit of the rest of humanity, even though it’s our tax money that’s going into it, and has been going into the research for so long. How long have they been working and why have they been working so long on genetics? What’s the reason for it?

--

All geneticists are eugenicists because it starts off in your first course to do with eugenics, superior and inferior types. Therefore at the start of their training at university they become true believers in eugenics to begin with.

We’ve been told the double helix and the genes and so on, wasn’t discovered until Watson came along around the ’70s or so. And that they’d always suspected that there were things called genes – this was standard in all medical training for many many many years – but they hadn’t found them. They just

suspected they were there, we're told. But yet if you go into the writings of the greatest mathematician that the Royal Society could produce called [Ernest] Rutherford – he's the guy they sent off abroad to do the equations for the pyramids and so on, for the Royal Society – in his own memoirs he said that in the early '20s he was employed on scientific research as a mathematician to work on genes. Why would you need mathematicians working on genes for something you haven't discovered yet? You can't see them, unless they could see them. And I believe that's how far ahead they truly were back then. They did know the genes were there. They were working on them heavily because the agenda since at least Darwin's time onwards was to create a superior type of human.

They toyed with the idea of creating even a superior type of worker, to serve the superior class; someone who could be very very healthy, bright enough to accomplish all the tasks but not too bright to overthrow the dominant minority. That's what their utopia, or their utopic idea, is basically based upon. Some of them are so arrogant, like Julian Huxley; who was the first CEO of UNESCO, who said that UNESCO'S function by the way – the United Nation's organization for education worldwide – was to create a standardized system of education across the world so that all children could be manipulated into the same thought patterns, belief patterns and mentality basically – a standardization process; a Plato's cave that we'd all grow up in, never knowing anything outside of that cave. He was quite blatant about that. It was for social engineering purposes, not for educational purposes as such.

Now eugenics goes back into the most ancient times. All kings and queens were mated up – for their supposedly inherited traits as leaders, and even as gods – by the priesthoods, who kept records of the traits, the physical and mental personality traits of offspring of these unions. The one thing that was lacking was a monied class, who also use the same techniques. We find this coming out with the Rothschild family. So you had monarchies running the world, running an empire such as the British Empire. All you needed now was the monied system to go along with it. We find the Rothschilds worked on the same principals as monarchies; they inter-married each other to keep the same intellect, abilities and so on going. With the Rothschilds we find they only marry their nieces, their immediate nieces, down through the generations.

We find Benjamin Franklin, very interesting man, long before this, again, high freemason – this is in his own records at the Franklin Institute; he joined the English lodge, he joined other lodges, he became eventually the Grand Master of the Nine Sisters lodge in France. He initiated Voltaire in as a member, and others, but he was also a member of the Hellfire Club in England. Benjamin Franklin talked about the carriers; he called them 'dollies'. These are women who had selective genes. They were the products themselves of selective special breeding. And the Hellfire Club, like many high masonic institutions of that time, had what were loosely called – loosely called and wrongly in a sense – brothels attached to them. But it was also a cover because the special carriers or 'dollies' – and dolly is the term that Franklin himself coined, it's still in use today; a dolly is a carrier like something you carry luggage on or whatever

– basically he said that those who are worthy to go on and breed with these particular women (who were of noble birth most of them) would have the pleasure of having the offspring, knowing they had the offspring and the offspring was guaranteed a life of high exposure in science and perhaps leadership in the world. Madame Bouvier was the one he was talking about initially at the Hellfire Club – it's in High Wycombe, London. And Madame Bouvier's descendants still live; there's two of them in France today, and the other one was Jackie Kennedy.

If you look at how politics is run, and you go into the writings of people like Lenin for instance, Lenin said that there are a thousand directions and systems in which people could go and live under, but the public mustn't know that. He said it's important that the system that's created for them is accepted by the people so that they think that it's the only system that could possibly work. And it's true; we're contained in a system of left and right, supposedly the have-nots against the haves, or those who own the means of production against those who don't; the workers. And that's traditional Labour versus Tory or Conservative versus Democrat – that's how the system is run. It keeps the public contained within a system of thinking that it must be one or the other, or a middle road in between, which they push. It never occurs to the general public that society has lived in the past under many different types of systems. And as Lenin said, it's important that the public don't know that the system they were born into was designed for them and that it could be any different; they must think it's the only natural one that could have evolved in their lifetime.

Therefore you're contained within a restriction of parties. You vote in one party when you're sick of the last one – not because you want the new one in, it's because you're sick of the last one and what they've done to you. And once they've been corrupted and gone off in different tangents – in ways which they never explain during the entire elections, and nothing to do with their election promises – you vote them out and get the next party in. And so we go on forever with this left-right paradigm. It's like a tennis match really with the public in the middle; we're the ball, and we just simply go back and forth between left and right, left and right, left and right. Meanwhile, we're being shepherded all along in one direction, because politics is a tool of the elite to manage the public. That's all democracy in fact really is; a tool of the elite to contain the public, manage them, and guide them along a pre-determined path that's outside of any kind of democracy.

If you take Bush, what he was sent in to do was to wait. And I believe this truly; he was to wait for 9/11 happening in 2001. 2001 happened, every country automatically went on board with the same agenda, at the same time, which shows pre-planning – bureaucracies in different governments do not work that fast. It takes years to get that kind of cooperation, that kind of synchronicity working together, in synchronization. Bush's job was to bring in a totalitarian system – under the guise of protecting the

public – where you lose your rights, and set up the machinery, the agencies to do it; the military forces, the paramilitary forces now (that the police have become) to set up the institutions for enforcement of laws. Obama comes in, takes over the institutions that are now set up, and his job is to guide you through the economic depression and use those forces against the public at the required time. That's how it works. It's a continuity as far as I'm concerned; it's not a separate regime whatsoever. The same boys who put Bush in – the bankers and all the rest of it – put Obama in. And Obama's proved his loyalty to them by literally allowing them to rape the public of all their funds and then rewarding them by public funding and tax money to save the same bankers. He's one of their own boys. But he now has the machinery in place that Bush set up to quell the coming riots – that they say are going to come – and to manage the public into a brand new system of what they call not government but governance, international governance.

If you listen to Obama's speeches before he was elected and analyze what he actually said, he said very little. He was giving emotive speeches with no substance. He never said what he wanted to do or how he's going to do anything. It was almost like a lead up to a movie that hadn't been made yet; emotional talk, talk of hope, but not saying how the hope would be transformed into realities. He used the term that's been used in academia for the last few decades, in the Ivy League schools and universities, of "the century of change". So his slogan became – and they use slogans, written for them – "change is good". Any idiot should ask the simple question "wait a minute, what change are you talking about?" How can you be for change if you don't know what the change is going to be? It could be for your detriment.

But they got the people parroting like George Orwell said with the sheep, you know "four legs good, two legs bad", "change is good" and the people, his followers start to repeat it; "change is good". What kind of change are we talking about? The loss of sovereignty? The blending into an international institution? A world government system? A system where not only is America bankrupt and the most indebted nation on the planet – for loaning money out to other countries and policing the world, being the policeman of the world – now Obama wants to lead the charge on sustainability, carbon taxes, by making America the example for the rest of the world to follow. He's asking everybody to sacrifice everything they have. That's what he means by "change is good".

He didn't dream up this plan. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Again, that comes from the Milner Group, the Cecil Rhodes society, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, that planned world government using the British Empire as the model – which has now become the American Empire in a sense. And the change he is talking about is a new world of servitude, where you will serve the world state. And you will also have to pay off all your debts along the way, which is impossible as far as I'm concerned; you cannot ever pay the kind of debt America has incurred since World War II. It's impossible to pay back.

Therefore the change he's talking about really is a New Deal. When you hear a new deal mentioned by any president – and we got that from FDR, we got it from Bush, the last Bush that was in, a new deal, we're getting it from this administration – that's a legal admission; a legal admission from the leader of your country of a new system. A new deal is literally a new system. The first system was the constitution, you got an updated system with FDR as government became incredibly big and centralized, and now you've got a new deal under the guise that change is good.

Who planned the change? It wasn't the people who planned the change. Who will benefit? It will not be the people; it's the world of sustainability, Mr. [David] Rockefeller, the population reduction plan. Those who will go into the future will be those who are necessary for the future's maintenance, and those who are simply obsolete – the 'useless eaters' – will have to perish and die off. It's as simple as that.

This generation today, the ones who are alive today, we are the generation that's going through the biggest changes in history – according to even Rockefeller himself – since the industrial revolution. It's the end of one part, one phase of a long-term plan. And out of this comes a new world order, as they've said. Mr. [Gordon] Brown said – the [previous] Prime Minister of Great Britain – said at the G20 meeting recently "it's a new world order"; a different order from the previous one, where people technically, technically were working for themselves, would choose their own employment and so on. The new world order is a planned system, a planned economy, a planned population.

So it's up to us – it's not up to the next generation – to change this. We're the only ones who can possibly do the changing. And it's either really the right to go into an uncertain future – which is what life should really be – where we decide for ourselves where we want to go individually and collectively, or allow ourselves to be dumb animals; creatures who are guided by those who have decided they are the masters of our destiny, and allow ourselves gradually to be sterilized, killed off, used for the last part of their agenda and their wars, and then cast off.

Many people will love socialism. They enjoy being guided and they enjoy their bosses running the world for them. But it's up to those who like freedom, personal freedom, which also entails uncertainty of where we're actually going to go.

October 22, 2025 at 7:43 am

[EDIT](#) | [MOVE](#) | [SPLIT](#) | [TRASH](#) | [SPAM](#) | [UNAPPROVE](#) | [REPLY](#) [#922](#)

Shock And Awe – The Manipulation Of The Human Psyche



Alan
Keymaster
(127.0.0.1)

by Alan Watt

Alan Watt: I'm Alan Watt and I've been following politics and geopolitics for a good part of my life. I didn't start off deliberately going out to find out everything that was possibly going on. In fact I had no idea to be honest with you how vast the scale of an agenda, a political agenda is when you're bringing in a global society.

Wars have many different purposes; economics is only simply one big part of it, but culture change and the building of Empire through the defeated Nations joining in Leagues. Every country was basically signing the same laws – and had been my whole life, at the same time – that affected their societies. Laws were introduced and bills were introduced, unbeknownst to the people in those countries that it was being introduced in their neighboring countries or even across the water somewhere at the same time.

I realized there was already governmental control obviously, that coordinated all of this, and it led me into the United Nations. For every single department of government you have on a federal, local, county, state, provincial level, the United Nations had an equivalent department to deal with everything. It was already set up in fact to be global government. H.G. Wells said at the League of Nations – which was the embryo for the United Nations – he said this is the nucleus of the world government.

When eventually all laws will come from there, be passed and signed into law by treaty of all the member countries, eventually we won't even have to go through the farce – and that's what it is – of voting in parties or candidates. Because in the latter part of the 20th century and now into the 21st century we're being trained, rather obviously, to simply accept rule by experts, rule by scientists, rule by professionals. And that's what they mean when they call government 'governance' – that's the term used.

--

How do you get a domesticated herd to move from a field – a system in which it's been grazing for twenty, fifty years, this kind of system – to this field over here, this new field? Because we're reluctant, we have reluctance to change. We like familiarity, we like routine you see. You do it by various techniques, one of which is revolution. Most revolutions are bloodless; you have cultural revolutions, sexual revolutions – along with that comes the music revolutions etc. These literally are designed to alter and direct culture, knowing what kind of culture they'll have at the very end of it too. They know exactly what kind of culture they want to come out of it.

You can also do it through crisis creation; crisis after crisis has been hit on the people of the world since 9/11 happened, and we must understand that the techniques that are used abroad are also used at home in warfare. And we heard the term “shock and awe”; shock and awe on the hard – the hard force level as they call it – is bombs, all kinds of acoustic equipment to nullify enemies, scare the hell out of them through voice-to-skull and so on, which was used in Gulf War 1 and it was all over the British media.

But you can also use shock and awe on your domestic people again; you do it by crisis after crisis until the public are so terrified. You see the average person has a sort of confidence that they build up, where they think “I can manage most things that come my way. Whatever little crisis in my life, what happens to other people, I can deal with.” When all those around you are getting scared at the same time as you because they’re losing their jobs, they’re being threatened with pandemics, terrorists everywhere, terrifying people to even get on subways and so on, and all those around you are also in the same boat, you tend to be more easily directed by the powers-that-be that come out and speak with authority and confidence over you. That’s why they give you a guy like Obama, who’s trained in oratory. He was trained in oratory – not in truth, but in oratory; the technique of persuasion.

Shock and awe, as I say, is a technique of making a person and a whole population punch-drunk. And each one of those fears – you understand the average person can handle one major crisis in their personal life, maybe two at the same time. It’s understood in psychology and many many studies that if you have maybe three to four crises hitting you personally in your life at the same time, you will literally go into an incredible depression, a reactive depression. You can’t cope. That’s understood. Apply that technique on a whole population.

The thing is, there’s not one of these crises that we’re being told about that you personally can do anything about. What can you do about terrorism, if it really exists all over the place? It’s out of your hands, you’re helpless. What can you do about a coming pandemic? It’s out of your hands, you’re helpless. What can you do about a nuke getting set off in New York Harbor or wherever? You can’t, you’re helpless. The message you’re getting is that you’re utterly helpless to defend, help, or save yourself. That is complete shock and awe tactic that’s been used, not only in the U.S. and Canada, but across the world – same strategy, because we’re already global with a global society running us all. Massive psychology and warfare techniques in psychology is being used across the planet to make us succumb to fear and crisis, none of which we can actually do anything about on an individual level.

Therefore the leaders are presented to us onscreen, with uniforms or business suits and ties as politicians who speak with confidence – all scripted of course – and they seem to have everything under control. You’re now basically a fearful slave looking up to the powerful master to defend and protect you. That’s the simple technique of it.

I've been speaking about the Rockefeller Foundation. I was mentioning the fact that in the United States the Rockefeller Foundation which also runs, I think it is the Carnegie Foundation today, maybe even the Ford, they're all combined; the families that are given the intergenerational rights if you like, or authority, to lead the world to amalgamation under global governance. Mr. Rockefeller also is heavily involved in the world depopulation strategies; he funds abortion clinics across the planet. He also funds hundreds of other front foundations that you would think were independent from his, but they're actually front foundations. He funds them all through his money. You can trace them all back again to so-called "family planning" clinics across the entire globe, especially in the third world countries.

It seems that Mr. Rockefeller is intensely worried about overpopulation in the near future, from countries which will have no industry etc. and he sees it as his right to start the decimating process basically, of depopulation. Last winter I got an invitation to attend something called the World Citizenship Council, the annual meeting. That kind of floored me because the head of the World Citizenship Council is Mr. Rockefeller himself, and here I am speaking out about and against them. So this did not come out of the blue, they try and get you on board working for them. What was also more startling was they always give members maybe 15 minutes or 20 minutes to speak, and I was offered that to speak on stage to this world meeting.

The World Citizenship idea is part of the old idea of Cecil Rhodes, up into Lord Milner, to the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Rockefeller is up on Google in some of his conferences giving out World Citizenship awards to very famous people. So they already bypass and have bypassed sovereign nations a long time ago. What other benefits you get from being a world citizen I'm not certain at all. But he said I would be allowed to speak at this conference. He did not say what to speak about, or didn't say anything on what not to speak about. And he also said – this chairman of course, who wrote to me – he also said that I'd be allowed to participate in the Round Table groups which come after.

The Round Table Society is very very important because the Round Table societies were set up as far back as the Milner Society and the Rhodes Foundation; they came out with the first Round Table societies. What they do is take the topics that are discussed at the main meetings, then they split off at different tables to specialize in certain aspects of the speeches they've heard and find ways how to implement them into reality through media promotion, various methods of propaganda and so on.

I did not attend. I was tempted to go just to see if they would ask me not to speak about certain things, but it was the middle of winter and the journey to this university would have been pretty hectic anyway, and I was so busy. But you will be approached and that's not the first time I've been approached to do

this kind of thing. You'll find that some people are bought over. I should go back to Lord Bertrand Russell on this topic because Lord Bertrand Russell said in one of his own books, the same book in fact where he talks about those children who manage to escape the indoctrinations – who have intelligence and an ability to communicate to others – must be brought on board the system, employed by the system, bribed into the system if possible; that generally works with most people. He said otherwise we shall have to eliminate them, because they did not want people around who understood an agenda that the general public are unaware of, didn't want these people with the ability to communicate information, documented information, in a fashion that people will understand, out in the community where they could spread this word.

That ties in with Mao Tse-Tung who said he was not afraid of armies – his worst fear was someone with a good idea, a great idea, a unique idea, and the ability to communicate it. So that is how they treat, basically, people with information. First comes the invitation to join them. Many people do – as I say Bertrand Russell backed that up by saying if they can't be brought on board they must be literally eliminated from the public arena. That's how seriously they take this agenda at the top. They don't mess around.

The reason I think they don't simply come out and kill you, straightforward, is they don't have to do a messy job – there's many ways of killing you, especially in this day and age. But I think to be honest they're so arrogant right now at this moment, they're not too worried about the mass of the general population who are indoctrinated and updated with their indoctrination daily from television, as one example.

--

About a hundred years ago this big organization with many branches that wanted to rule the world basically, using Britain as a nucleus of a system, an embryo which was also going to be joined with the U.S. under the Anglo-American Establishment, wrote about the kind of culture and the changes of culture over a hundred year period that they would actually design.

We're all tribal to an extent; that's why we even bother to vote for a tribal leader. This is well understood; that's why we're supplied with these leaders. And because the average man was to become more disengaged from his own destiny as the expert class arose, it was decided that the males would get their outlet basically, gradually becoming helpless as males, through sports. Therefore they'd have a tribal team they could identify with; they could cheer them on as though they were winning. In their own personal lives they were getting nowhere. They were getting disenfranchised in a sense, as experts took over decision-making for them in all kinds of fields. So this was psychology at use, planned before they even implemented the sports. When radio came along, of course they used that to the maximum; sports

for the men, radio soaps basically for the women. And then in came television with its alpha state, its hypnotic state. It took off. It really really took off and men became glued to the sports shows.

The big think tanks – and we've had think tanks to do with always planning the future and how they would create societies and even different cultures between, within a hundred years say from this type of society to that society to the next society, how they'd implement it. Again, always through the youth culture which is easy to do if you have universal education. You can always mandate the same system, same culture to be taught to the youth. However, as I say since the 1960s once television really really took off, sports used to only come out on Saturdays, and over a ten year period it gradually came on every night of the week, until today we have even sports channels; sports, sports, sports.

And you see guys who are sitting at home, who are basically powerless at work; they have bosses, they're powerless on the road, there's police and traffic wardens and cops watching them – they have no means to feel strong. And so they tend to watch sports as a substitute. They project themselves into a game which they never participate in. As long as their team wins they feel something's happening in their life that's positive, and it's successful. It's a very good substitute for many many things as far as the elite are concerned.

Now, the big think tanks that involved many professional people knew that they'd have to give something that's for the males and for the woman they'd also give a substitute too. The intention being, ultimately, to alter society; drastically alter it so much that even the purpose of marriage, for instance, would lose any appeal. For the females they gave them high fashion – accessible prices for high fashion, clothes.

People don't realize they brought in the miniskirt back in the 1920s, during prohibition. They brought in cocaine at the same time along with the booze, to get young people in. The idea being that if you were doing something illegal, it's very naughty; youngsters love to break the rules, get together, we're all being naughty together. And sex and booze – coupled with coke being smuggled in at that time – had its desired effects, but not quite the way it was designed to have by those who planned that culture; the Bernays types. And [Edward] Bernays was heavily involved in this.

So they came out, as I say, with not sex and rock and roll, but sex and a form of jazz. The Charleston dance came in, the miniskirt came in, sex became rather rampant for the first time; all the old traditional taboos were broken with one generation. But there was fallout to this change, this massive change in culture. The fallout being that they did not have the antibiotics to treat all the sexually transmitted disease that came along. Secondly, they didn't have the legal abortion clinics to take care of the unwanted children that also were produced by hyper-promiscuity. They opened up big orphanages to try and take care of this; the Boys Towns. They had ones for girls too.

But there was so much backlash – especially in the United States from the old Christian communities – that they had to tone it all down. It kind of flopped. Sexually transmitted disease became rampant, so did unwanted pregnancies and abortions. And so they went back to the drawing board because remember, before this all happened the big players – the new high priesthood we'll call them, of the time lords; those who create the future, work in think tanks for the big establishment – had a definite mandate. The only problem was: how do you achieve that mandate over a time period? So they went back to the drawing board. And they've always known for instance that in wartime more children are produced because people – young people who might go off to die tomorrow – tend to be far more promiscuous.

They brought this back after World War II big time. They worked on it steadily. All our tax money went into one particular area of research – not just the atomic weaponry and so on – it went into finding ways of finding a contraceptive that was effective. When they found it they launched it on the scene at the same time as they launched what they called “pop music”, along with drugs, LSD and so on. They brought out the contraceptive, so then permission was given in a sense, and promoted from the top down – even from the BBC.

Remember, the BBC is owned by the British government; it's an arm of the British government. It talks on behalf of the dominant minority who rule Britain. So they began to promote all this stuff. All the DJs they'd bring on television would interview the top pop stars of the day. They were all stoned out of their minds, some of them were falling out of chairs, and the interviewers would say “tee hee, aren't we naughty children.” All aimed at a young generation to emulate. This is what we do; monkey see, monkey do.

Once again, remember the prime intent was to break the old culture of boy meets girl, going together for a while, getting engaged, getting married, having children. The family unit, they'd said when they had the League of Nations – which was the precursor of the United Nations – said they'd have to destroy the family unit.

Pretty well all of H.G. Wells' non-fiction books promote all of this agenda. And in fact he coined the term in the late 1800s – this is how far back this agenda for promiscuity had to go – he coined the term “free love”. In one of his books, written before 1890, he says we must promote free love in order to destroy and end the obsolete family unit. Once that's done, he said the family is no longer in the way when government comes for an individual. Each individual will be solely responsible to the government itself and no family will stand up around them like a primitive tribe and defend them.

At the same time the foundations within the United States and Britain and elsewhere were funding what appeared to be far left groups; communist groups. So much so that the Reece Commission went in to look into this from the '50s to find out why top capitalists – who owned international corporations and

banks, international banks – were putting up foundations to fund far left groups. Well we know now that it was to literally destroy the old culture in order to bring in the new culture, the new society.

So therefore you have the proliferation of sexual activity. The fallout still came from unwanted pregnancies, far reduced than it had been before because of contraception. But then came the lead of the feminist charge – again, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation in the States – to spearhead and demonstrate and demand the rights for abortion. If they could get the public to devalue human life – and that's in the writings of Julian Huxley; he says if we can get society to devalue human life and take humanity off its pedestal as a supreme being on the planet, then, he said, we can bring in our controlled society with a workable population.

Everything works within culture towards an agenda. And as Plato said so long ago – over 2,300 years ago – he said culture and cultural changes must be authorized from the top. If it's grassroots, truly grassroots, then it's outside of the elite's control and ripple effects could occur and it could spread anywhere; they couldn't control it, contain it anymore. Therefore the major changes in culture – which Plato said came through drama and the emulation of actors, actresses, including fashions that they wore, and the music they heard – had to be strictly regulated and authorized from the top.

The whole science of this – which was always a science, and understood by those in those businesses – was used to the maximum to literally drastically alter culture so radically in the '60s and '70s that they could never return to a past way of living. We tie that in with another big player; Lord Bertrand Russell, who had experimental schools under royal charter, where he could do things that anyone else would be locked up for doing. He said in his own schools – and they were mixed schools – he said that if you could encourage pre-pubertal sexuality amongst the children, encourage multiple partners, from before puberty, he says the chances – because of study and observation – the chances of them ever bonding with one person for the rest of their life was pretty well obsolete, null and void, wouldn't happen.

Therefore that technique all came into play during the '60s. It was called free love. Drugs helped it along the way. And that was the beginning of what we saw as short-term relationships. Divorces become more and more common. Interestingly enough, divorces really took off not because society demanded it, or it came from a need or demand from the people; divorces took off because of the Hollywood stars. Now remember too, the drama industry, the entertainment industry have always said this; the people follow the stars. And they're the guiding stars in the so-called occult, you see.

We tend to worship wealth and people, and famous people. We want to be like them, we want to identify with them. The whole idea of divorces came out from Hollywood, with the top stars leading the charge for this. Women started to talk about it; who was getting divorced, what actress from what guy and so

on, and gradually it put the idea across to them that well if they're getting divorced, then maybe so should I.

At the same time the Bernays techniques were used through all kinds of magazines. At that time 97% of all magazine publications were aimed at women, because advertisers have said – and it's still taught in marketing schools today – woman are far more easy to get to go along with something new than males are. So within all these magazines and write-ups about their famous actresses, their heroines and so on, the rich ones, the average women were reading these stories and identifying with them. They were being told that you can do anything, you can have it all; you could have a career, you can have a family, have a home. They gave them utter lies, and they coined the term 'superwoman'.

So across the whole of Europe and the States, and Canada at the same time – always coordinated at the same time – the media and entertainment industry were promoting stories of superwomen and they'd find someone real or imaginary, we'll never know, who supposedly was a CEO of a company, who had all these children at home, had a great husband, could manage everything, and could cook great cuisine, blah, blah. And that, of course, is a fantasy. This put pressure on most women, to try and live up to the fantasy, as all advertising does.

And most of the stuff we're getting is advertising, or at the very least it's basic psychological manipulation; Bernays techniques again. Remember too that he called it the creation of a consumer society; well behaved people – as long as there's money going around, they would go into the material world and they would forgo having children. That's the same thing as Charles Galton Darwin talked about; if we can encourage the woman and the male to go after the material benefits of the world, there's a slimmer chance they'll actually have children, who tend to be economically burdensome.

People were addicted to television in a very short space of time. Most people still today think that all entertainment to do with movies and drama is there for nothing more than their entertainment. It never ever was that case. The greatest social messages are promoted through movies and drama, high drama, through the fixation of emotive sequences, emotional sequences. Not logical, factual sequences, but pushing points across in an emotional way which register and fix in the mind – so emotional content is very very important, rather than going through an actual discussion or an argument using logic and facts. There's no debate. And when you're being downloaded through fiction, your guard is down. The censor part of your brain is not in action, as it would be in a debate or a lecture; you're actually in an alpha state being completely downloaded with new ideas, very similar to a computer.

And so therefore a culture industry, which is called by its own "the culture industry" – the Soviet Union had a department called the culture industry. Their actors and directors were called the cultural leaders. All you have to do is keep giving them new updates every so often, and you can change an entire

country or a nation or a bloc of nations, who are all getting the same uploads, upgrades at the same time, along certain paths. Today we call it political correctness.

Most people want to belong to their peer group. They want to be the same as everyone else when it comes to opinions. In fact, they judge their own personal sanity by bouncing ideas off their neighbours and friends, who will answer back and agree on these same topics in kind. It doesn't matter if the topics or what you're given are facts or utter nonsense, as long as everyone agrees at the same time – you'll say "well I'm sane" and your friends will all agree because they've had the same information given to them.

We don't only get the same information given to us; we're led through sequences – even by documentaries – to leave you with a predetermined fixed conclusion, on any given topic. Most folk are, once again, unaware of this; they think "I've just been given all the facts on this topic and this is the obvious conclusion" which is always given to you by the final experts on the particular program. There's no thinking involved.

We tie this in with [Zbigniew] Brzezinski: Brzezinski said in his book *Between Two Ages* – now this guy was way up with the NSA, he's a master geopolitician, he admits that he works in 20, 50 year periods to do with geopolitics in other countries – he said himself the public will shortly be unable to think or reason for themselves. He was meaning by the form of information that was given to them, the type, the formulas that were in use then in the 1970s. And eventually, he said, they will expect the media to do all their thinking and reasoning for them. Well that's happened today. That's why people today can't think outside of their programming from television.

To give an instance in fact of why TV was so important, to show you that it was so important to have it in the homes of ordinary people; most countries in Europe for instance up into the 1950s and '60s – and I'll give an example as Britain – the working class people did not have credit cards. You could not get a credit card. You couldn't get a bank loan without collateral, to put something up against it. So therefore you were at pretty well a fixed income; there was no extra cash outside of rent, food and so on, clothes for the children, essentials. There were no extras for luxuries. There was no credit given to them, yet the British government – just like the Chinese government did two years ago – made it a mandate that every household in Britain must get a television set. And what they did, they made one exception – out of all the things that the people could need, really needed, they made one exception – they allowed credit companies to come into being. They could go round the houses every week and collect half a crown, or five shillings or whatever it was, and pay off a used television set.

The British government made a deal with the United States of America to buy in used televisions, which were then reconditioned, to be sold to the working class all across Britain. As I say, they wanted a TV in

every home. Now since when is government interested in how happy you are at home? You know, there's another reason for this. And sure enough the working classes all got these DER – DER was the company that brought them all into Britain – and the guys came round every weekend collecting their half a crown, five shillings.

And suddenly – and I can remember where I was, it was one of the last areas really to get television; a real working class area – I can remember at this high [height] being taken by my parents to the local park on a weekend, and passing dozens and dozens and dozens of other couples on the way with their toddlers as well. When you got to the park which was a valley, there were over maybe a thousand, a thousand and a half couples along the grass in the valley. And that's where everything was discussed; local politics, national politics, labor unions to do with their mining and so on. And everyone mingled with everyone else, old school friends and so on. That system had been going on for hundreds of years – hundreds of years, where people communicated thoughts, real feelings, real things that really mattered to them and their communities to each other; conversation. When the TV came in, and I was still about this high, within about a month I could go down that park every weekend and no one – I mean no one – was there. It literally overnight killed off the socialization and interaction between people, and tradition, again where they exchanged viewpoints, gave each other news, helped each other out, who was sick, who was this, who was that, everyone helped each other out.

From then on you could pass rows and rows and rows of these houses – and they were called row houses, all joined together – and all you saw at night was the flickering of that bluish light in the windows, and that was the end. That was the end of real communities. It happened within a matter of about a month.

The flicker rate on the television is very very important. It was timed to be so many cycles per second, and it actually just meets with the brain patterns for an alpha state. When our brain sees it through our eyes, we start to adopt that flicker rate in our mind and we go into a deep alpha state. Watch children, and watch their mouths; they drop open. They won't hear their parents talking. They're hypnotized in fact.

Why would they give you that particular flicker rate, when they could have chosen out of a whole variety of flicker rates? It wasn't an essential thing to have, so it was done for a purpose; it was meant to be hypnotic. It was meant to be used a tool of propaganda and indoctrination, even through the guise of entertainment and so on. It was also to create a new society, because they were the avant-garde, as I say, leading the sexual revolution, through drama, through little documentaries, fiction, non-fiction, all combined.

Once again back to Plato, the audience sees what they see. You have to understand that it's even worked out towards different age groups, there's something on for everybody, everybody's age group;

each age group is actually being updated as well – even the elderly ones – into new ways of thinking, or seeing things. But the target mainly was for youngsters.

If we take one of the world's experts on propaganda who is Jacques Ellul, who wrote extensively on how the mind works and how all entertainment, he said, that has to do with government programs such as police, detective stories, detective series, which contain little human dramas as the hook that you identify with, to make you watch the whole story; child gets kidnapped, detective goes on a hunt, he goes through hell and fire to get that child back. You identify with the hero if you're a male, you'll identify with the heroine if you're a female – and that's the hook to get you to watch them. What he said was all dramas to do with police or even the military, in movies, are pure propaganda; pure propaganda.

The human story is just the bait to make you watch through it, to get you to identify with it. Because once again, there's always a message left somewhere in the movie. It might even be a message that's against your own morality. It could be where the cop for instance, does sleep with this beautiful woman, while his wife is at home, and it's all part of the story. And they even tell you why he did this; he was feeling down that day, blah, blah, blah. And so you've just again altered your viewpoints on how you yourself might behave in that situation, and that sometimes that kind of thing can be justified. That's how you're downloaded through entertainment. It's there to alter and direct, and always upgrade into another step of the direction that the entire culture moves, for someone else's purpose.

Let's talk about the effects of the alpha state first of all. Recent articles I've even read on the air, from various science studies, show you that even when you switch off television you remain in that alpha state for maybe 45 minutes to an hour, sometimes longer, depending how long you've been watching it. With high definition, again, why would a president of a country mandate that all TVs have to go high definition? Is it because he really cares so much about your happiness, and he wants better quality for you? Or is there another reason for it? Well I'm sure the effects of the old flicker rate and what it did will also be incorporated in high definition, but with even more added benefits for bringing you into a complete hypnotic state.

How do you wake someone up who is addicted to television? You can't – very very simple. You can't get your daily brainwashing – where literally it's bypassing any consciousness in the person – you can't take that every day and still try to wake up and learn at the same time. I've known people who have gone through complete withdrawal from television and gone into depressions, because their entire routine is broken. They also have time on their hands, which is a big aspect of control, remember too; if you can take time away from a person who can think for themselves, who might say "I'll go and read a book, I'll go and study something", if you can take that time away from them and have them mesmerized in front of a television set, then you'll keep them dumb, stupid, compliant and going along with the system.

I always advise to people, if you know someone who is watching TV it's quite simple to find out where they are mentally, psychologically in the understanding of things; you can ask them a few simple questions. If they give you standard television answers forget it – simple as that; forget it. If you see some spark of their own opinion coming in, there's maybe a chance you can do something with them.

You see television can be classified as a drug. Any addiction is still an addiction. Television is an addiction; people watch four, five hours per day. Top psychologists, and even the United Nations, have talked about the use of television for creating the new culture for children. How many people know that all government agencies – or departments, all governments in the world basically – have departments of culture which hire cartoonists – and pay their expenses – to do cartoons, always incorporating the latest political correct story to do with the environment, waste, bad adults and how they've destroyed the planet through their consuming etc.? How many people realize, as you plonk your children down in front of it to baby-sit them, that they're actually being brainwashed, scientifically? And these cartoons were designed by experts, to get their message across to those children, implanted in their young minds, fixed in their young minds forever, for the rest of their lives, ongoing daily. And even right down to the novels that you read the children, that are designed for children too, which will incorporate all of this – all paid by government grants to authors and writers. You literally have to take it into your own hands. It's one of the most dangerous tools that can be used.

It's also dangerous in this extent: why do you think government licenses TV stations? If you were an independent producer, TV station, who came out with this kind of information, you would not get a license. You would have to be authorized and politically correct, with a whole bunch of things to do and not to do written out before you'd be given a license. And you'd be checked on every so often to make sure you were following those topics that you were allowed to.

If you want to advise people on television – and you can do this with yourself, how to train yourself how to watch television – you never get involved; you understand a storyline, you watch a movie but don't get involved in, as I say, there's always a thread or a hook for you to follow, a plot, whatever, the chase; the guy always ends up with the beautiful woman at the end after going through hell to rescue a child, or save the world or whatever it happens to be. If you can stop yourself from getting lost in the emotional part of it, and study the movie as you're watching it, you'll learn the techniques that have been implanted in the movie itself. That's a great way to learn. If you do it with yourself, you can also show other people how to do this, to actually study everything as it's being presented to you. And eventually what you'll find is that when you're watching even documentaries, you'll see how the documentaries themselves are shaped to give you the opinions (often very strong opinions) without giving you specific facts, or giving you distorted facts etc. Learn how to critically analyze and think as you're watching.

And if you can show others this technique; a good example is to sit down with someone who regularly watches a good movie – one that you've previously watched – and then point out all the politically correct, little inserted words, slogans, phrases that have been put in there and show them, show them how it's been done. That way it can actually be fun to study television. And write down all the different things that they've missed. But it's all implanted subconsciously in their mind, because those implants – those subconscious implants – will become their opinions and they will never know how they arrived at them. They won't remember it's from this particular documentary, this particular movie or whatever. So that can also be fun. That's a positive side of it; you can train anyone to do this.

With the internet, the first person to mention it that I know of – at least to the public – was again this master Brzezinski in his book *Between Two Ages*. In the early '70s he said shortly a system will be given to the public, of mass communication, which will cause a revolution; it'll be a revolutionary thing to change society. But he also mentioned and hinted at the fact that there would be regulation behind it. He mentioned too that those who brought it in would never lose control, the main control over the internet, because after all knowledge is power. Knowledge has always been power – that's why all down through the ages the real machinations of government are never told to the public; real power comes from understanding and having all the facts on any particular topic.

So therefore the internet was to be given to the general public with other intentions. Initially it was to get them all into it. Now, what did the elite want to achieve? What was their point of view? They wanted people to become so used to the internet that they couldn't do without it. Now we see businesses really can't do without it; they can't imagine going back to pencil and paper and taking inventory, and all this kind of stuff. For the youngsters, who must be the generation they target, they made sure that – it's the only thing I knew about the internet, from the media, I was completely ignorant about it, and computers – the only thing I knew was there was lots of pornography on it. Every paper kept telling you about it, which again is the same old technique they used in the '60s and '70s – aren't we naughty, wink wink, for the rock stars on television – knowing all the youngsters would get into it when their hormones are high; that's all they're thinking about. But once folk were addicted to it, they also planned to gradually alter it, keeping the people addicted to it as they changed it into another system where mainstream media – the authorized media, the culture creation industry media – would eventually have prime, or the main dibs; the first grabs at the main bandwidth that eventually they're claiming will have to be reduced.

So in the meantime, there's never been a window of opportunity for the general public to use a medium to communicate to each other alternate news, verified facts to each other, as we have at the moment. That eventually, supposedly, is going to be policed. They've had international meetings, the first one held in Canada – under the auspices of the United Nations – to do with regulating and censorship of the internet. They have these meetings every year as they add more laws to it. We know the Cloud system is to come in eventually – it's been all over the media in Britain – where you won't be able to store anything

on a hard drive; you want even need a hard drive eventually. Remote servers will have all your information for you. It will then be used as a form of punishment; if you were politically incorrect in some form or another, then you'll be cut off from accessing that server with all your data, until you toe the line and behave yourself.

Social control can be used through money, monetary penalizations, or through other penalizations like withdrawing your access from it. It definitely will be used for social control again, unless there's a backlash from the general public. And they do expect backlashes from people who have become used to looking into whatever site they wish to look at, or communicating whatever kind of information they want to, to each other.

Now, along with the introduction of the internet we've got to remember too, the government agencies also set up and promoted chat rooms and all the rest of it, and there are agents within this strange nether region called the internet, whose job it is to infiltrate people who are coming together as groups, communicating on specific topics to do with political changes, and disrupting those groups. So already it's a battlefield – and they called it “the cyber wars” long before they even gave this internet to the people. It would be an informational war they said, in all the papers, therefore government intelligence agencies would have to expand their roles with mandates to also be in this invisible world, where they would manipulate various groups from within as well.

There's also a lot of nonsense of course on the internet too, which can take you down conspiracy paths. I hate the term ‘conspiracy’ because the government wants us to use it like we're some sort of hobbyists, and some sort of kooks; I don't use the term. But that's become the most popular type of site now; the ‘conspiracy’ site, and there's many out there. There's professional agents out there as well, who have been funded by governments, and even launched by governments to be well known – especially in Europe – to lead the conspiracy sites. Then they bring in the UFOs, the aliens, until they have achieved their goal.

Counterintelligence – let's talk about counterintelligence and how it works. What is intelligence? Intelligence gathering is sending agents out to simply listen; they listen in market places, bars, cafés, as to what the people are discussing. Lawrence of Arabia, in his own book *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* [said he] was trained as an agent; he was trained in Aramaic, Arabic languages. He was given lots of money – he and eleven other people, trained from Cambridge – and sent over to the Arabic countries to start up Arabic newspapers. Once they started putting stories in the newspapers they went round the market places, they hired lots of guys to listen to gossip, to see if the intelligence they were putting out in the papers was being discussed by the recipients, the readers. That's basic intelligence gathering. What is counterintelligence? Counterintelligence, from a government's perspective, is taking information and

data that could be crucial – it could be bad for the ruling regime – and finding ways to counter that knowledge; counter it.

What you do, standard-wise, if you can't defame the person who's bringing out a truth – or kill them – is to bring out your own heroes; launch them well, finance them well into the same area, saying the same stuff that others are talking about – it's called intelligence – giving out facts. And once they have the following, then they start bringing in aliens and UFOs, and they bring in the new age, the whole new age religion into it – spirituality is the big term they're using today – until a newcomer, a skeptic will hear this stuff from the paid agent (who's very good) who gives the same data as the person who doesn't go into the UFOs and so on. But the guy who doesn't go into the UFOs, aliens, reptilians and all the rest of it, suddenly is thrown out with the other guy; you're classified with them by association. Your topics are associated, even though you stay clear of the fantasy stuff – the disinformation – you'll be lumped along with them. And then they've countered the intelligence; when you mention the facts people laugh at you, say "oh you probably believe that the aliens are running the world now." And that's it. That's counterintelligence, and that is also all over the internet. And it's paid for by, again, government psy-ops operations.

Some groups I've found are doing really good work, where people decide to get together, physically. And they will choose a book to read to do with the factual data that's available to the public that can be proven. And they'll go through it; they'll analyze the book, they'll analyze the phrases, they'll analyze the contents. They start to participate in what they're reading because others will remember this particular era, this time, when this event happened, can add to the thing and so on. That's participation, that's communication. And other information from those involved, who lived through things, can be added to the whole thing, giving you a much more complete picture. So it's a good idea to start this kind of thing off in your local area, even if it's only two of you that start it off. Don't sit and laugh – it's kind of comical at first when you say "we're going to discuss this book" and you've never done anything like this in your lifetime. Sit down and get yourself a coffee or a beer, or whatever you need, and take turns at reading. And ask the other guy, do you have anything to add to what I've just read? Do you have any insights into it? What do you think of this? It gets you stimulated into participating and really thinking, because everybody who's alive today has been trained literally not to have to think.

As Brzezinski said; shortly the public will be unable to reason or think for themselves – they'll expect the media to do their reasoning for them. So let's counter that. Let's get back to thinking for ourselves, using the data, the material; get involved, start using our minds again. And you'll be surprised – it's like a muscle that you haven't used for a long time – how quickly you start to use it, how sharp you become so quickly. And if you can get larger and larger groups together doing the same thing and then you can branch them together, communicate together, then they suggest other books that you haven't heard of – maybe you need a particular book for evidence. I have stacks of them at home.

Everyone has access somewhere to some material they've got stuck away, and when you start putting all of this material together, mainly through, as I said, discussion and reading groups, you can add to the knowledge. The more knowledge and facts, actual factual data you can put together, the bigger your arsenal is and the easier it becomes to show people and convince them: "Look, this is authenticated stuff. Here's the factual data, here's the physical book." Read from that book and then have your discussions; what do you think about this? What do you think they meant by this? What do you think has happened? Have they fulfilled this part of an agenda? And most folk will say "yeah, they have." Well here's how they did it.

The evidence is all there but knowledge, remember, is scattered. That's also why since the '70s and so on, televisions were put up in places where people used to communicate to each other; bars and restaurants, the pubs of Europe. Everyone talked and discussed everything. The televisions were all put in for a reason, and now everyone's mesmerized when you can hear sports or loud music; you can't communicate anymore. That was government promoted, because the government licensed the big chains of taverns and pubs all throughout Europe.

So what you've got really is a deliberate attempt – nothing happens for no reason. Why? The customers weren't demanding they were bored in bars as they discussed topics; people would just move around the pub talking and listening to the conversations and you'd join in the one that you liked. Why was it so important to destroy communication? It's because it's the main propaganda tool; it stops communication between people even in a room. If you notice too, they don't even discuss the topics once the news is read to them to each other. They've both been downloaded with the opinions. You don't have to ask what their opinion is; it's going to be the same one as you've been downloaded with, left by the expert.

So we've got to get back to communications, and communicating with each other, and finding the evidence. Knowledge is scattered; knowledge is power so it's scattered all over the place, in thousands of books. But when you can start these reading classes up and get other reading classes communicating with you even through the internet, you can start putting the data, the factual data together so that you can present it to the public, and bring in more and more members. Only knowledge, and the will to use this knowledge, is going to thwart the plans that have openly been made for us and declared by the elite at the top.

The whole problem of being involved in a community can be a double-edged sword. We know for instance that 'communitarianism' is a term used first by Bush senior, talking about the collectivist society coming in. The United Nations has us all split up into communities; it's promoted through local TV. Even Sudbury here has "your community" – this is your local community, be involved in your community. They're talking about a politically correct community, that's the problem. Government really penetrated

and altered and distorted and changed society through communities – not just with television, which has certainly destroyed the community spirit.

The intent of government – and this is how abusers work too; abusers work with the same technique, because they want power over a victim. The abuser will come in and take care, initially, of problems of the abused. Often the problems are the very outcome of what the abusers have been doing to the victims in the first place. Government came in with welfare for instance a long time ago, in all countries at about the same time. At one time families helped each other out. You didn't need welfare. If someone lost their job everyone chipped in. You didn't condemn the family member for being unemployed or ill or whatever, or losing their job. Families helped each other. The family, remember, is still really the smallest nucleus of a tribe. And then government came in with unemployment insurance – which they took off you, nothing was for free. And gradually over time, when people became unemployed or even sick for a while and couldn't work, I heard people even say to their own relatives "well go to welfare; that's what they're for. There are social agencies to deal with this." Until today we're in a sad state where even close relatives won't help each other out. They expect the government – the abuser; the government is the abuser – they expect the government to take care of all financial problems for the unfortunate victims, and they stop helping each other out.

We've got to start reclaiming the right to – and you can do it personally, with people you know – to help other people out and start countering the government's mandate, because the government's mandate is for control over the victims, not to help the victims. Those who fall under that particular level into the welfare state have their lives run by government agencies and social workers. That's what Huxley said; he said they won't need their survival capabilities – Russell said the same thing – because the government is taking care and making all their decisions for them. Not to help you, it's really to take you over and have you obeying them and their system.

That's what you're up against; a planned war strategy, making them dependent upon government services – not their family units, not their brothers and sisters, their fathers and mothers, but on the state itself. We've got to counter that and become involved again in the lives of those around us and have our own true communities. It doesn't matter if there's only five of you in a community, even if you live in a town or a city; that's your own little community, where you all have something in common. What it really is, is gaining knowledge for your own – and others' – self-preservation and survival into the future.

October 22, 2025 at 7:43 am

EDIT | MOVE | SPLIT | TRASH | SPAM | UNAPPROVE | REPLY [#923](#)

Dec. 25, 2009



Alan

Keymaster

(127.0.0.1)

“Merry Christmas, 2009”

Hi folks. I am Alan Watt and this is Cutting Through The Matrix on December 25th 2009. I hope you’ve all had – as they’ve said for centuries in the past – a Merry Christmas. It’s taboo to say so apparently today because it’s politically incorrect. Well, political correctness is for those who’ve already succumbed to the war on their minds and yet they can snap out of it if they wish to and just say, Merry Christmas. It’s that easy.

When you think back on it, we’ve gone through so much of a war on us. In fact it’s been on for our whole lives long; your parents went through it and your grandparents went through it. Most never even knew it was happening. They were given external wars, somewhere over there, and they never knew the war was really being waged back at home, covertly, through stealth and through techniques using science, propaganda and mass media communication. Eventually it filtered in to the school system and I’ve gone on before in other programs that I’ve given over the years about how the media takes over and of course entertainment, it’s very important.

Those who control entertainment actually control the direction of thinking of whole generations. That makes it more palatable when your teachers in school or professors in university bring up the same topics that first were introduced in fiction to you. You listen to them thinking we’re all hip, as they used to say, we’re now cool apparently and even though we’re in global warming, we’re all cool. We accept every new attitude and every direction that’s given to us to play out in our lives. It’s up to you if you want to go along with it or not.

It doesn’t matter if the crowd goes one way, you know they are wrong. The crowd is always wrong... because the bulk of the populace goes along with political correctness. They wouldn’t care if it’s a King or a tyrant or a Caesar or whatever running them, as long as they all went along together and suffered equally. That’s what equality is in socialism. You all suffer equally, down below that is. Down below the ivory castle... there is always an ivory castle where the big boys look down their long noses at you and play with you, as you play with dolls in a doll house; how they stand, how to walk, how to speak even, what your topics should be, how you should deport yourself in any given situation, and they give you the given situations. Since they are all perverted at the top, they give us a perverted society and we emulate them. We emulate them. It’s that simple, very, very simple.

That’s why the battle has been for individualism all down through the centuries. We keep forgetting that individuals changed the world in previous times. That’s what Christianity and Christmas was supposed to be all about. Not the mass. The mass will always adopt the ‘in’ religion of the time, be it New Age, Hinduism, whatever is given to them and promoted by the top guys. The individual has always been what the war is about. If you can destroy individuality and people with the ability to reason and have

perceptions of their own and voice them, then you change the whole world. The whole world will be changed once again.

It doesn't matter if an individual stands up and says something so true, like 'the king has no clothes' and then the rest of the crowd parrots that same thing. The crowd will parrot whatever they are given to parrot. The problems we have today is because the scientific elite have given us a society where the masses are supposed to simply parrot and adapt into a preplanned doll's house of the future. That's not living. That's zombieland... zombieland. What the human individual is capable of attaining is so far out, way out into the universe, that it's the biggest threat they've ever had, in the positions of tyrant. That's why you've got to be group consensus, group opinion, group-speak, group-speak with new-speak, and linguistic minimalism to boot, through your music.

Sex... is all that is promoted through music today. That's all. Base. You must separate the sexual act from loving someone. The big writers of the 1800s who were promoted through communism wrote screeds about that very thing; how to disassociate the loving part, the bonding part from the sexual act. They've been very successful in their war. As I say, when you get a bunch of teenagers for the first generation and say go to it, there's no fallout from this, here is a pill, here is contraception, we have abortion clinics, do what you want, you have no responsibility at all in whatever happens to you. We will take care of it for you. Then you stop the bonding process. Julian Huxley said the same thing. He said, if we can create a generation that has plenty, plenty of sex with no consequences then we've broken the bonding process which is their main enemy. The family unit is the main enemy of those who are in control today.

Those who are in control are not just far lefties, with their little duffle bags and their sneakers. No. That's just the parts of the army that you see there. You have those who control the entire monetary system of the planet with their own particular, very secret religion, very ancient religion too, who truly believe they are here to dominate the world and it's their right to do so. Interesting that Rockefeller, when he was giving a talk to some reporters who attended the CFR meeting, he said we could never have this without your compliance and secrecy... to the media. Meaning, they kept their mouths shut about what was happening. He said, it's far preferable to have a world ruled by bankers and intellectuals rather than to let the nations run their natural course. That's something most folk can't wrap their hands around.

They think that communism is some workers' movement. That was the biggest red herring ever put out there. It's been so swallowed so well by everyone on the planet, except those who put it out, of course. Domination is the name of the game and individuality is their main enemy. The United Nations has said so too; the INDIVIDUAL is their main problem. Why do you think they are talking about brain-chipping people? Yes, they will sell it to lots of people on how it's going to help you. You won't have to go to school eventually, you just get downloaded. They'll give you pleasure centers in the brain for hyper sex and all this stuff. You'll be a programmed zombie. People will rush into that... and you must let them rush into it

because they are goners. They have decided to be goners. Having the GIFT of life is too heavy a burden for them to bear. And that's their tough luck. But for YOU, you must think for yourself, reason for yourself and become individualistic.

As I say, this time of year is about Christianity. The whole idea was about an individual that changed the world... of course soon to be corrupted because whenever truth comes into the world, those that follow afterward always corrupt for power over others. They too have their day, till the next perversion is done on the next one who stands up. It doesn't mean you must forget or adapt to the new system. All is not hopeless. That's the point of some of the greatest religions on the planet; that ALL is not hopeless or lost.

The government does not rush to your aid when you are having a spiritual crisis or a personal crisis. You have to go to other areas to find answers to that. Yes, the government will supply you with their version; here's psychiatry and its pills, psychology and its pills, and its mantras and all the rest of it. That is not the way that you attain intelligence or experience or belief. It's like postponing everything. You know, psychiatry for instance, is about replacing religion; that's why they brought it out. That's why Freud was sent out on the mission to, again, augment Darwinism and say, well, you're nothing but an animal. The whole point was to be happy, regardless of what's happening. Be happy, take these pills and once you're having sex out there again, and you're purchasing things and you're working, then they will classify you as healthy. That's what they call healthy in psychiatry. That's their whole point. And yet, their point is to get you back into the system that broke you down in the first place by artificial means and back in to the artificial system.

They are drugging so many people today, so many people. Drugging people doesn't mature you. You can not mature. You must go through painful processes to mature, to become a FULL, complete human being. You must suffer because through suffering you not only learn things, you also realize your connectedness to other people around you. That's why you don't judge the same way. You've been there or you could be there in the future. It doesn't mean you turn your back and don't judge evil. You must speak out against evil wherever you see it. That's a preservation instinct. Don't ever forget that.

Here we are, as I say, on Christmas 2009. We know the agenda. We know what the steps will be coming from the big boys at the top that run the world through mainly their finances, to be honest with you. Control the finances of the world and you control the world. Everyone is trained to use their finances. In fact, there's no other option. It doesn't mean they will win eventually and it's up to you to decide if you win personally... because that's what it's about. It's not the collective; it's about the personal.

I dragged out the guitar from its coffin – as usual – today, wrote this song down quickly, played it through for the first time, no corrections or alterations; so excuse me if it's not to your taste and the fingers are a bit stiff, but it's the best I can do at the moment. That's what you ALL are about really, is the

best you can do at the moment. Give it your best. Enjoy this piece. If we're all alive next year, I'll give you another one then too. Merry Christmas, all the best, from Alan and Hamish in Ontario, Canada.

Author

Posts

Viewing 8 posts - 271 through 278 (of 278 total)

← 1 2 3 ... 17 18 19

Reply To: Alan Watt on "Truth Quest with Melodee"

Your account has the ability to post unrestricted HTML content.

Visual

Code



Tags:

☐ Notify me of follow-up replies via email

Submit